

COMPLEX ANALYSIS METHODS IN NONCOMMUTATIVE PROBABILITY

Serban Teodor Belinschi

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Mathematics
Indiana University
July 2005

Accepted by the Graduate Faculty, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Hari Bercovici, Ph.D.

Scott W. Brown, Ph.D.

Ayelet Lindenstrauss, Ph.D.

Zhenghan Wang, Ph.D.

17 May 2005

Copyright 2005
Serban Teodor Belinschi
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Acknowledgements

First of all, my deepest thanks go to Professor Hari Bercovici. Without his teaching and constant, careful, and patient guidance, nothing of my PhD, including this thesis, could have been accomplished. I am deeply grateful also to Professor Zhenghan Wang. I have learned a lot from him, and his help and support (including financial, through an RAship) have been determinant for the completion of my work towards a PhD. I regret very much I wasn't able to do more!

I thank Professors Ayelet Lindenstrauss and Scott W. Brown for their active participation in my PhD committee.

I have learned very much from many faculty members of the IU Department of Mathematics, either during courses, or in private discussions. Among them, I would like to mention Professors Steen Andersson, Eric Bedford, Hari Bercovici, Michael Larsen, Ayelet Lindenstrauss, Charles Livingston, Russel Lyons, Kevin Pilgrim, and Zhenghan Wang. I also thank Misty Cummings for all the help she gave me with the so-many bureaucratic problems.

Special thanks are due to Professor Șerban Strătilă, who first introduced me to the realm of advanced mathematics, and whose help, trust, and guidance made possible for me to become a student at IU. I also thank Professor George Dincă for his help and teaching.

Finally, I thank my parents and my grandparents, to whom this thesis is dedicated, and all my friends.

Abstract

We study convolutions that arise from noncommutative probability theory. In the case of free convolutions, we prove that the absolutely continuous part, with respect to the Lebesgue measure, of the free convolution of two probability measures is always nonzero, and has a locally analytic density. Under slightly less general hypotheses, we show that the singular continuous part of the free additive convolution of two probability measures is zero. We also show that any probability measure belongs to a partially defined one-parameter free convolution semigroup. In this context, we find a connection between free and boolean infinite divisibility. For monotonic convolutions, we prove that any infinitely divisible probability measure with respect to monotonic additive or multiplicative convolution belongs to a one-parameter semigroup with respect to the corresponding convolution. Our main tools are several subordination and inversion theorems for analytic functions defined in the upper half-plane. We prove these theorems using the theory of Denjoy-Wolff fixed points.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
Chapter 1. Regularity properties for free convolutions of two probability measures	7
1. Regularity for the free additive convolution of probability measures	7
2. Regularity for the free multiplicative convolution of probability measures on the positive half-line	
3. Regularity for the free multiplicative convolution of probability measures on the unit circle	51
Chapter 2. Semigroups relative to free convolutions	57
1. Partial semigroups with respect to free additive convolution	58
2. Partially defined semigroups with respect to free multiplicative convolution on the unit circle	68
3. Partially defined semigroups with respect to free multiplicative convolution on the positive half-line	
Chapter 3. On monotonic infinite divisibility	84
Bibliography	93

1. Introduction

The idea of noncommutative analogues of classical mathematical notions like topology, geometry, measure theory, or probability, derives from operator algebras. In the classical (commutative) context, one can usually associate to a given space an appropriate set of complex-valued functions defined on that space. This set becomes a commutative algebra under the operations of pointwise addition and multiplication of functions. Properties of the original space can be then expressed in terms of the algebra associated to that space. In the noncommutative context, one replaces the commutative algebra of functions with a noncommutative algebra (usually, but not necessarily, of operators). We exemplify with the case of interest for us.

To define a probability space, one specifies a triple (Ω, Σ, P) , where Ω is a set, Σ is a σ -algebra, and P is a probability measure. Consider the space $L^\infty(\Omega) = L^\infty(\Omega, \Sigma, P)$ of essentially bounded measurable functions $f: \Omega \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, endowed with the linear functional

$$\varphi: L^\infty(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \varphi(f) = \int_{\Omega} f dP.$$

It is known that $L^\infty(\Omega)$ is a W^* -algebra. Let us observe that for any set $A \in \Sigma$, the characteristic function of A ,

$$\chi_A(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \in A \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega \notin A \end{cases}$$

belongs to $L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $\varphi(\chi_A) = P(A)$. Conversely, if $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfies $f(\omega)^2 = f(\omega) = \overline{f(\omega)}$ for P -almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, then $f^{-1}(\{1\}) \in \Sigma$ and $f = \chi_{f^{-1}(\{1\})}$ almost surely. Moreover, $\varphi(f) = P(f^{-1}(\{1\}))$.

Thus, it appears natural to give the definition of a noncommutative probability space as it follows:

DEFINITION 0.1. *A noncommutative probability space is a pair $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, and φ is a linear functional on $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\varphi(1) = 1$. An element $x \in \mathcal{A}$ is called a random variable. The distribution of x is the linear functional μ_x on*

$\mathbb{C}[X]$ (the algebra of complex polynomials in one variable), defined by $\mu_x(P) = \varphi(P(x))$, $P \in \mathbb{C}[X]$.

For an introduction to the subject, we refer to [36]. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ will be called a W^* -probability space if, in addition, $\mathcal{A}$ is a W^* -algebra, and φ is positive and weakly continuous. We shall generally consider the case when φ is also a trace (i.e. $\varphi(xy) = \varphi(yx)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$) in which case we call $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ a tracial W^* -probability space. Let us observe that $(L^\infty(\Omega), \varphi)$ is a tracial W^* -probability space, and the notion of random variable in the noncommutative context translates in the classical case as “bounded random variable”. Moreover, if $x = x^*$ is a selfadjoint random variable in a W^* -probability space, then μ_x extends to a compactly supported probability measure on the real line, i.e. there exists a unique probability measure $d\mu_x$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} P(t) d\mu_x(t) = \varphi(P(x)) \quad \text{for all } P \in \mathbb{C}[X].$$

While the classical notion of independence still has a meaning in the noncommutative context (see [36] for details), new types of independence arise naturally in noncommutative probability theory. We record here the definitions of the three types of independence that we shall encounter in this paper. In the following three definitions, $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$ is a noncommutative probability space, and $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are two subalgebras of $\mathcal{A}$.

DEFINITION 0.2. *The unital algebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are called free (or freely independent) if $\varphi(a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n) = 0$ whenever $a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{i_j}, i_j \in \{1, 2\}, i_1 \neq i_2, i_2 \neq i_3, \dots, i_{n-1} \neq i_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varphi(a_{i_j}) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$.*

DEFINITION 0.3. *The (usually not unital) algebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are said to be boolean independent if*

$$\varphi(a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n) = \varphi(a_1) \varphi(a_2) \cdots \varphi(a_n)$$

for any $a_j \in \mathcal{A}_{i_j}, i_j \in \{1, 2\}, i_1 \neq i_2, i_2 \neq i_3, \dots, i_{n-1} \neq i_n, n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j \leq n$.

DEFINITION 0.4. *The (usually not unital) algebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ are called monotonically independent if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) for all $a_1, b_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$, we have $a_1 a_2 b_1 = \varphi(a_2) a_1 b_1$;
- (2) for all $a_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $a_2, b_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$, we have $\varphi(a_2 a_1 b_2) = \varphi(a_2) \varphi(a_1) \varphi(b_2)$, $\varphi(a_2 a_1) = \varphi(a_2) \varphi(a_1)$, and $\varphi(a_1 b_2) = \varphi(a_1) \varphi(b_2)$.

A pair of random variables $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ is said to be independent in any of the above senses if the subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ (unital in the case of free independence) generated by a_1, a_2 , are independent. Definition 0.2 is due to Voiculescu [36], definition 0.4 to Muraki [25], while the notion of boolean independence was first explicitly formulated by Speicher and Woroudi [30], but its origins can be traced to Bożejko [15].

These notions of independence make it possible to define several types of convolutions of probability measures. It is known from the classical probability theory that any compactly supported probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ can be realized as the distribution of a selfadjoint random variable X_μ belonging to some W^* -probability space. Roughly speaking, to define a convolution of two compactly supported probability measures, one considers a pair of subalgebras of a noncommutative probability space which are independent in the required sense, and finds in each of the algebras a selfadjoint random variable distributed according to each of the two probability measures; the distribution of the sum will be equal to the convolution of the two probability measures. The following definitions make the above description more precise.

DEFINITION 0.5.

- (a) Let μ, ν be two compactly supported Borel probability measures on the real line. The free additive convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \boxplus \nu$, is defined as the distribution of $x_\mu + x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are selfadjoint random variables belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, free from each other, and distributed according to μ and ν , respectively.
- (b) Let μ, ν be two compactly supported probability measures on the positive half-line $[0, +\infty)$. The free multiplicative convolution μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \boxtimes \nu$, is the distribution of $x_\mu^{1/2} x_\nu x_\mu^{1/2}$, where x_μ and x_ν are positive random variables belonging

to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, free from each other, and distributed according to μ and ν , respectively.

- (c) Let μ, ν be two probability measures on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ in the complex plane. The free multiplicative convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \boxtimes \nu$, is the distribution of $x_\mu x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are unitary random variables belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, free from each other, and distributed according to μ and ν , respectively.

Definitions (b) and (c) have been extended to measures with noncompact support in [10]. For more details, we refer to [36] and [10].

DEFINITION 0.6.

- (a) Let μ, ν be two compactly supported Borel probability measures on the real line. The boolean additive convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \uplus \nu$, is defined as the distribution of $x_\mu + x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are selfadjoint random variables belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, boolean independent, and distributed according to μ and ν , respectively.
- (b) Let μ, ν be two probability measures on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ in the complex plane. The boolean multiplicative convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \boxtimes \nu$, is the distribution of $x_\mu x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are unitary random variables belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, distributed according to μ and ν , respectively, and such that $x_\mu - 1$ and $x_\nu - 1$ are boolean independent.

These definitions appear in [30] and [21], respectively. The extension of part (a) of the above definition to measures with noncompact support is done using analytic methods (see Theorem 2.6 below).

DEFINITION 0.7.

- (a) Let μ, ν be two compactly supported Borel probability measures on the real line. The monotonic additive convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \triangleright \nu$, is defined as the distribution of $x_\mu + x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are selfadjoint random variables

belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, monotonic independent, and distributed according to μ and ν , respectively.

- (b) *Let μ, ν be two compactly supported Borel probability measures on the positive half-line. The monotonic multiplicative convolution of μ and ν , denoted by $\mu \circ \nu$, is defined as the distribution of $x_\mu x_\nu$, where x_μ and x_ν are selfadjoint random variables belonging to some tracial W^* -probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \varphi)$, distributed according to μ and ν , respectively, such that $x_\mu - 1$ and $x_\nu - 1$ are monotonic independent.*

Observe that, unlike the previous convolutions, monotonic convolutions are *not* commutative. Monotonic additive convolution has been introduced by Muraki [25], while its multiplicative version has been defined by Bercovici in [6]. As in the case of boolean convolution, one can define monotonic convolutions of probability measures with noncompact support with analytic methods, as it will be seen in Theorems 3.1 and 3.9.

It is not hard to see that the independence condition makes each of the above seven operations well-defined. The way to construct independent random variables as in the above definitions can be found in [36] for the case of free independence, [30] for the case of boolean independence, and [25] and [6] for monotonic independence.

The present thesis focuses on an analytic perspective on the convolutions defined above, which will be described in the main body of the thesis. Our main interest will be in the free convolutions. We will also point out connections between the three types of independence defined above. These connections have not yet been explored to their fullest extent.

The thesis has three chapters. The first two chapters have three sections each, while the much shorter third chapter is not divided into sections. In the first chapter we focus on regularity properties of free convolutions. The first section of Chapter 1 introduces a number of definitions and theorems from complex analysis that will be used all along the thesis, and describes the absolutely continuous, singular continuous and atomic parts of the free additive convolution of two probability measures, with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Specifically, we show that the absolutely continuous part is always nonzero, the density function is locally analytic, and, under slightly less general conditions, the

singular continuous part is zero (Theorem 1.23). Our main tool is a subordination result for analytic functions (Theorem 1.16). In Sections 2 and 3 we prove similar results for free multiplicative convolutions of probability measures supported on the positive half-line and on the unit circle in the complex plane, respectively (Theorems 1.36 and 1.43). Note however that the existence of a singular continuous part remains open in these cases.

The second chapter is dedicated to proving the existence of partially defined semigroups with respect to free convolutions (Theorems 2.2, 2.10, and 2.17). Our main tools are three inversion theorems for analytic functions. In Theorems 2.3, 2.11, and 2.18, we describe the absolutely continuous, singular continuous, and atomic parts of such measures. A brief mention of a connection with boolean convolution is also made.

In the third chapter we generalize results of Muraki and Bercovici on monotonic infinite divisibility. Namely, we show that any probability measure, not necessarily with compact support, which is infinitely divisible with respect to monotonic additive, and, respectively, multiplicative, convolution belongs to a one-parameter semigroup with respect to monotonic convolution.

CHAPTER 1

Regularity properties for free convolutions of two probability measures

This chapter is dedicated to describing the absolutely continuous and atomic part of free convolutions of measures.

In the first section we discuss the behavior of the absolutely continuous part with respect to the Lebesgue measure of the free additive convolution of two Borel probability measures supported on the real line, none of them concentrated in one point. Namely, we show that the absolutely continuous part is never zero, its density function is locally analytic, and continuous everywhere where it is finite. The results are derived by studying the boundary behavior of the subordination functions. As a byproduct, we also obtain a new proof of Biane's subordination result.

The second and third sections are dedicated to proving similar results for the free multiplicative convolution of probability measures on the unit circle and the positive half-line, respectively. In addition, we also describe the atomic part of free multiplicative convolution of two probability measures. (The analogous result for free additive convolution is already known.)

1. Regularity for the free additive convolution of probability measures

For any finite positive measure σ on $\mathbb{R}$, define its Cauchy transform

$$G_\sigma(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\sigma(t)}{z - t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}.$$

Since $G_\sigma(\bar{z}) = \overline{G_\sigma(z)}$, we shall consider from now on only the restriction of G_σ to the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+ = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$.

For given $\alpha \geq 0, \beta > 0$, let us denote $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \Im z > \alpha, |\Re z| < \beta \Im z\}$. The analytic function G_σ satisfies the following two properties:

- (i) $G_\sigma(\mathbb{C}^+) \subseteq -\mathbb{C}^+$;
- (ii) For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}} z G_\sigma(z) = \sigma(\mathbb{R}).$$

Remarkably, as the following theorem shows, any function satisfying these two properties is the Cauchy transform of some finite positive measure on $\mathbb{R}$ (for proof and details, we refer to [1]).

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $G: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow -\mathbb{C}^+$ be an analytic function. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a unique positive measure σ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $G = G_\sigma$;*
- (2) *For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we have that*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}} z G(z)$$

exists and is finite.

- (3) *The limit $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} iy G(iy)$ exists and is finite.*

Moreover, the two limits from 2 and 3 both equal $\sigma(\mathbb{R})$.

Observe also that

$$-\frac{1}{\pi} \Im G_\sigma(x + iy) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{y}{(x-t)^2 + y^2} d\sigma(t), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0,$$

is the Poisson integral of σ .

It turns out that in many situations it is much easier to deal with the reciprocal $F_\sigma = 1/G_\sigma$ of the Cauchy transform of the measure σ . The following proposition is an obvious consequence of Theorem 1.1:

PROPOSITION 1.2. *Let $F: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ be an analytic self-map of the upper half-plane. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a positive measure σ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $F = 1/G_\sigma$;*
- (2) *For any $\alpha, \beta > 0$, the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}} \frac{F(z)}{z}$ exists and belongs to $(0, +\infty)$;*
- (3) *The limit $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(iy)}{iy}$ exists and belongs to $(0, +\infty)$.*

Moreover, both limits from 2. and 3. equal $\sigma(\mathbb{R})^{-1}$.

In general, analytic self-maps of the upper half-plane can be represented uniquely by a triple (a, b, ρ) , where a is a real number, $b \in [0, +\infty)$, and ρ is a positive finite measure on $\mathbb{R}$. This representation is called the Nevanlinna representation (see [1]).

THEOREM 1.3. *Let $F: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ be an analytic function. Then there exists a triple (a, b, ρ) , where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \geq 0$, and ρ is a positive finite measure on $\mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$F(z) = a + bz + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1 + tz}{t - z} d\rho(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

The triple (a, b, ρ) satisfies $a = \Re F(i)$, $b = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(iy)}{iy}$, and $b + \rho(\mathbb{R}) = \Im F(i)$.

The converse of Theorem 1.3 is obviously true.

REMARK 1.4. An immediate consequence of Proposition 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 is that for any finite measure σ on $\mathbb{R}$, we have $\Im F_\sigma(z) \geq \sigma(\mathbb{R})^{-1} \Im z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, with equality for any value of z if and only if σ is a point mass. In this case, the measure ρ in the statement of Theorem 1.3 is zero.

As observed above, any finite measure σ on the real line is uniquely determined by its Cauchy transform. Moreover, regularity properties of σ can be deduced from the behavior of G_σ , and hence of F_σ , near the boundary of its domain. In the following we shall state several classical theorems concerning analytic self-maps of the unit disk $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}: |z| < 1\}$ and their boundary behaviour, i.e. the behavior near points in to the boundary $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}: |z| = 1\}$ of $\mathbb{D}$. Because the upper half-plane is conformally equivalent to the unit disc via the rational transformation $z \mapsto \frac{z-i}{z+i}$, most of these theorems will have obvious formulations for self-maps of the upper half-plane.

For a function $f: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that the nontangential limit of f at x exists if the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow x, z \in \Gamma_\alpha(x)} f(z)$ exists for all $\alpha > 0$, where $\Gamma_\alpha(x) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+: |\Re z - x| < \alpha \Im z\}$. A similar definition holds for functions defined in the unit disc. We shall denote nontangential limits by $\angle \lim_{z \rightarrow \alpha} f(z)$, or

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\angle]{\alpha} \alpha} f(z).$$

The following three theorems describe properties of meromorphic functions in the unit disc related to their nontangential boundary behavior.

THEOREM 1.5. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded analytic function. Then the set of points $x \in \mathbb{T}$ at which the nontangential limit of f fails to exist is of linear measure zero.*

THEOREM 1.6. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a meromorphic function, and let $e^{i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$. Assume that the set $(\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}) \setminus f(\mathbb{D})$ contains more than three points. If there exists a path $\gamma: [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = e^{i\theta}$ and $\ell = \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} f(\gamma(t))$ exists in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, then the nontangential limit of f at $e^{i\theta}$ exists, and equals ℓ .*

THEOREM 1.7. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function. Assume that there exists a set A of nonzero linear measure in $\mathbb{T}$ such that the nontangential limit of f exists at each point of A , and equals zero. Then the function $f(z) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*

Theorem 1.5 is due to Fatou, and Theorem 1.7 to Privalov. Theorem 1.6 is an extension of a result by Lindelöf. For proofs, we refer to [18].

The following lemma will be useful in the proof of the main result of this section.

LEMMA 1.8. *Let $F: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ be an analytic self-map of the upper half-plane. Suppose $\gamma: [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ is a continuous path such that $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \gamma(s) = \infty$. Then the limit $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{F(\gamma(s))}{\gamma(s)}$, if it exists, cannot be infinite.*

PROOF. Assume that there exists a path γ as in the statement of the lemma such that $\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{F(\gamma(s))}{\gamma(s)} = \infty$. Observe that $F(z)/z$ never equals a negative number. Therefore, the range of the function

$$\Phi: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \Phi(w) = \frac{F\left(i \frac{1-w}{1+w}\right)}{i \frac{1-w}{1+w}}$$

omits more than three points from $\mathbb{C}$. Since $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} F(z)/z$ exists and is finite, Theorem 1.6 provides a contradiction.

□

Consider a domain (i.e. an open connected set) $D \subseteq \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, and a function $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. The cluster set $C(f, x_0)$ of the function f at the point $x_0 \in \overline{D}$ is

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \mid \exists \{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset D \setminus x_0 \text{ such that } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = x_0, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(z_n) = z\}.$$

The following result is immediate.

LEMMA 1.9. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a domain and let $f: D \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be continuous. If D is locally connected at $x \in \overline{D}$, then $C(f, x)$ is connected.*

This result appears in [18], as Theorem 1.1.

The following theorem of Seidel describes the behavior of certain analytic functions near the boundary of their domain of definition. For proof, we refer to [18], Theorem 5.4.

THEOREM 1.10. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be an analytic function such that the radial limit $f(e^{i\theta}) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta})$ exists and has modulus 1 for almost every θ in the interval (θ_1, θ_2) . If $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ is such that f does not extend analytically through $e^{i\theta}$, then $C(f, e^{i\theta}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$.*

This theorem can be applied to self-maps of the upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}^+$, via a conformal mapping, but in that case one must consider meromorphic, instead of analytic, extensions.

A second result referring to the behavior of $C(f, x)$ for bounded analytic functions f is the following theorem of Carathéodory. (This result appears in [18], Theorem 5.5.)

THEOREM 1.11. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded analytic function. Assume that for almost every $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ the radial limit $f(e^{i\theta})$ belongs to a set W in the plane. Then, for every $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ the cluster set $C(f, e^{i\theta})$ is contained in the closed convex hull of W .*

The previous two theorems allow us to prove the following

PROPOSITION 1.12.

- (a) *Let f be an analytic self-map of $\mathbb{D}$ such that $|\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta})| = 1$ for almost every $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$. Suppose that there is a point $\theta_0 \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ such that the function f cannot be continued analytically through θ_0 . Then for any $t_1 < t_2$ there is a set $E \subset (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ of nonzero Lebesgue measure such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta})$ exists for all*

$\theta \in E$, and the set $\{\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta}) : \theta \in E\}$ is dense in the arc $A = \{e^{it} : t_1 < t < t_2\}$.

- (b) Let f be an analytic self-map of $\mathbb{C}^+$ such that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(x + iy)$ exists and belongs to $\mathbb{R}$ for almost every $x \in (a, b)$. Suppose that $x_0 \in (a, b)$ is such that f cannot be continued meromorphically through x_0 . Then for any $c < d$ there is a set $E \subseteq (a, b)$ of nonzero Lebesgue measure such that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(x + iy)$ exists for all points $x \in E$, and the set $\{\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f(x + iy) : x \in E\}$ is dense in the interval (c, d) .

PROOF. Let f and θ_0 be as in the hypothesis of (a). Using Theorems 1.10 and 1.11, we conclude that, on the one hand, $C(f, e^{i\theta_0}) = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and on the other, that $C(f, e^{i\theta_0})$ equals the closure of the convex hull of the set

$$\{\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta}) : \theta \in G\}$$

for any set $G \subset (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ with the property that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta})$ exists for all $\theta \in G$, and $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \setminus G$ has zero linear measure. This implies that the set

$$\{\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta}) : \theta_1 < \theta < \theta_2, \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta}) \text{ exists and belongs to } A\}$$

is dense in A . It remains to prove that the set E of those $\theta \in (\theta_1, \theta_2)$ such that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} f(re^{i\theta})$ exists and belongs to A has nonzero linear measure. If this were not true, then, according to Theorem 1.11, we could replace G by $G \setminus E$ in the previous argument, and obtain a contradiction. This proves (a).

Part (b) follows directly from (a), by using the conformal automorphism of the extended complex plane $z \mapsto \frac{z-i}{z+i}$ and its inverse. $\square$

We will next focus on boundary behaviour of derivatives of analytic self-maps of the unit disk and of the upper half-plane. These results are described in detail by Shapiro [29]; see also Exercises 6 and 7 in Chapter I of Garnett's book [22].

THEOREM 1.13. *Let $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be an analytic function, and let $w \in \mathbb{T}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *We have*

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow w} \frac{|f(z)| - 1}{|z| - 1} < \infty;$$

(2) *There exists a number $\zeta \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that*

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]w} f(z) = \zeta,$$

and the limit

$$(1) \quad \ell = \lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]w} \frac{f(z) - \zeta}{z - w}$$

exists and belong to $(0, +\infty)$.

Moreover, if the equivalent conditions above are satisfied, the limit $\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow w} f'(z)$ exists, and the following equality holds:

$$\ell = \frac{w}{\zeta} \lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]w} f'(z) = \liminf_{z \rightarrow w} \frac{|f(z)| - 1}{|z| - 1}.$$

If

$$\liminf_{z \rightarrow w} \frac{|f(z)| - 1}{|z| - 1} = \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]w} f(z) = \zeta,$$

then the limit in equation 1 exists and equal infinity.

The number ℓ from the above theorem is called the Julia-Carathéodory derivative of f at w . The formulation of the preceding theorem for self-maps of the upper half-plane is similar; however, for the point at infinity, the usual formula of the Julia-Carathéodory derivative must be replaced by the limit

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]{} \infty} \frac{z}{f(z)}.$$

Consider now an analytic function $f: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. A point $w \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ is called a Denjoy-Wolff point for f if one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

(1) $|w| < 1$ and $f(w) = w$;

(2) $|w| = 1$, $\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow w} f(z) = w$, and

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]w} \frac{f(z) - w}{z - w} \leq 1.$$

The following result is due to Denjoy and Wolff.

THEOREM 1.14. *Any analytic function $f: \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ has a Denjoy-Wolff point. If f has more than one such point, then $f(z) = z$ for all z in the unit disk. If $z \in \mathbb{D}$ is a Denjoy-Wolff point for f , then $|f'(z)| \leq 1$; equality occurs only when f is a conformal automorphism of the unit disc.*

The Denjoy-Wolff point of a function f is characterized also by the fact that it is the uniform limit on compact subsets of the iterates $f^{\circ n} = \underbrace{f \circ f \circ \cdots \circ f}_{n \text{ times}}$ of f . We state the following theorem for the sake of completeness (for the original statements, see [20] and [37]):

THEOREM 1.15. *Let $f: \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ be an analytic function. If f is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$, then the functions $f^{\circ n}$ converge uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}$ to the Denjoy-Wolff point of f .*

We now prove a general subordination result for analytic functions.

THEOREM 1.16. *Let $F_j: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ be two analytic functions, which are not conformal self-maps of $\mathbb{C}^+$, satisfying $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_j(iy)}{iy} = 1$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and let $f: (\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ be defined by $f(z, w) = F_2(F_1(w) - w + z) - (F_1(w) - w)$. Then there exists a unique analytic self-map ω of $\mathbb{C}^+$ such that $f(z, \omega(z)) = \omega(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Moreover, $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\omega(iy)}{iy} = 1$.*

PROOF. Let us first observe that f is well defined. Indeed, since F_j is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$, by Remark 1.4 we have $\Im F_j(w) > \Im w$ for all $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $j = 1, 2$. Thus, for any z with $\Im z \geq 0$, $\Im(F_1(w) - w + z) > 0$, and $\Im F_2(F_1(w) - w + z) > \Im(F_1(w) - w + z) \geq \Im(F_1(w) - w)$. We conclude that the formula defining f makes sense, and f takes values in the upper half-plane.

We shall now prove that for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z)}{iv} \notin [1, +\infty].$$

Assume to the contrary that there exists an $\ell \in [1, +\infty]$ such that

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z)}{iv} = \ell.$$

Define $\theta: [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$, $\theta(t) = \frac{i}{1-t}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= \lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z)}{iv} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{F_2(F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z)}{F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z} \cdot \frac{F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z}{\theta(t)} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z}{\theta(t)} = 0$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{F_2(F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z)}{F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z} = \infty.$$

This is possible only if $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} [F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z] = \infty$. The path $\gamma(t) = F_1(\theta(t)) - \theta(t) + z$, $t \in [0, 1)$, satisfies the conditions of Lemma 1.8, and we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \frac{F_2(\gamma(t))}{\gamma(t)} = \infty$, and $\lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(iv)}{iv} = 1$. This contradiction implies that

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z)}{iv} \notin [1, +\infty].$$

Using this fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f(z, iv)}{iv} &= \lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z) - (F_1(iv) - iv)}{iv} \\ &= \lim_{v \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(F_1(iv) - iv + z)}{iv} \\ &\neq \ell \end{aligned}$$

for all $\ell \in [1, +\infty]$. Also, as seen above, $\Im f(z, w) > \Im z > 0$. Thus, by Theorem 1.14, we conclude that the Denjoy-Wloff point of the function $f_z(\cdot) = f(z, \cdot)$ belongs to $\mathbb{C}^+ + z$. Denote it by $\omega(z)$.

Since, by Theorem 1.14, $|f'_z(\omega(z))| < 1$, we can apply the implicit function theorem to conclude that the function $z \mapsto \omega(z)$ is an analytic self-map of $\mathbb{C}^+$. The uniqueness of the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z for each z guarantees the uniqueness of ω . This proves the existence and uniqueness of ω .

To complete the proof, we need to show that $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\omega(iy)}{iy} = 1$. As noted above, $\omega(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+ + z$, so $\Im \omega(z) > \Im z$, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. By Theorem 1.3, $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\omega(iy)}{iy} \geq 1$. The same argument applied to (F_2, F_1) in place of (F_1, F_2) provides a unique analytic self-map

of the upper half-plane $\tilde{\omega}$ such that

$$F_1(F_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) - \tilde{\omega}(z) + z) - (F_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) - \tilde{\omega}(z)) = \tilde{\omega}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

We claim that the analytic function $g: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$, defined by $g(z) = F_1(\omega(z)) - \omega(z) + z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, also satisfies

$$F_1(F_2(g(z)) - g(z) + z) - (F_2(g(z)) - g(z)) = g(z).$$

Indeed,

$$F_2(g(z)) = f(z, \omega(z)) + g(z) - z = \omega(z) + g(z) - z = F_1(\omega(z)),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & F_1(F_2(g(z)) - g(z) + z) - (F_2(g(z)) - g(z)) \\ &= F_1(F_1(\omega(z)) - g(z) + z) - (F_1(\omega(z)) - g(z)) \\ &= F_1(F_1(\omega(z)) - (F_1(\omega(z)) - \omega(z) + z) + z) \\ &\quad - (F_1(\omega(z)) - (F_1(\omega(z)) - \omega(z) + z)) \\ &= F_1(\omega(z)) - \omega(z) + z \\ &= g(z). \end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness of $\tilde{\omega}$ implies that $g = \tilde{\omega}$, and thus $\omega(z) + \tilde{\omega}(z) = F_1(\omega(z)) + z$. Since $\Im \tilde{\omega}(z) > \Im z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, the limit $\ell = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \tilde{\omega}(iy)/iy$ is at least one. In particular, $\tilde{\omega}(iy)$ tends to infinity nontangentially as $y \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore

$$\ell + \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\omega(iy)}{iy} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_2(\tilde{\omega}(iy))}{\tilde{\omega}(iy)} \cdot \frac{\tilde{\omega}(iy)}{iy} + 1 = \ell + 1.$$

We conclude that $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(iy)/iy = 1$, as desired.

□

Let us observe that, given functions F_1 and F_2 as in the above theorem, the pair of analytic functions $(\omega, \tilde{\omega})$ is uniquely determined by the system of equations

$$(2) \quad F_1(\omega(z)) = F_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) = \omega(z) + \tilde{\omega}(z) - z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

The following theorem describes the boundary behavior of the function ω .

THEOREM 1.17. *Let F_1, F_2, f , and ω be as in Theorem 1.16. Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and define the following two self-maps of the upper half-plane: $u_j(w) = F_j(w) - w + a$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume that $u_2 \circ u_1$ is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Then:*

- (1) *If $C(\omega, a) \cap \mathbb{C}^+ \neq \emptyset$, then the function ω extends analytically in a neighbourhood of a .*
- (2) *Assume that there exist open intervals I_1 and I_2 in $\mathbb{R}$ such that F_j extends analytically through I_j , $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow a} \omega(z)$ exists in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

PROOF. Consider a sequence $\{z_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}^+$ and a number $\ell \in \mathbb{C}^+$ with the property that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} z_n = a$ and $\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$. We have

$$\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(z_n, \omega(z_n)) = f(a, \ell).$$

If $f(a, \cdot)$ is not an automorphism of the upper half-plane, then we can use the implicit function argument from the proof of Theorem 1.16 to conclude that there exists a neighborhood of a in $\mathbb{C}$ on which the function ω extends analytically. On the other hand, if $f_a = f(a, \cdot)$ is a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$, denote by $k(\cdot)$ its inverse. The equality

$$w = f_a(k(w)) = f(a, k(w)) = F_2(F_1(k(w)) - k(w) + a) - (F_1(k(w)) - k(w))$$

can be rewritten as

$$u_2(u_1(k(w))) = w, \quad w \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

We conclude that $u_1 \circ k$ (and hence u_1) must be injective. We apply $u_1 \circ k$ to this equality to obtain

$$u_1(k(u_2(z))) = z,$$

for all z in the open set $(u_1 \circ k)(\mathbb{C}^+)$, and by analytic continuation, for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We conclude that u_1 is a conformal automorphism of the upper half-plane. But then $u_1 \circ u_2$ is also a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$, contradicting the hypothesis. This proves (1).

Assume now that the hypothesis in (2) is satisfied and yet $C(\omega, a)$ contains more than one point. By part (1), $C(\omega, a) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, and by Lemma 1.9, either $C(\omega, a) \setminus \{\infty\}$ is a closed interval in $\mathbb{R}$ (possibly all of $\mathbb{R}$), or $\mathbb{R} \setminus C(\omega, a)$ is an open interval in $\mathbb{R}$.

We claim that for any c in $C(\omega, a) \setminus \{\infty\}$, with the possible exception of three points, there exists a sequence $\{z_n^{(c)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to a such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n^{(c)}) = c$, and $\Re \omega(z_n^{(c)}) = c$ for all n . Let $\{c_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a dense sequence in $C(\omega, a)$, and consider $z_n \in \mathbb{C}^+$, such that $|z_n - a| < 1/n$, and $|\omega(z_n) - c_n| < 1/n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a path $\gamma: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \{a\}$ such that $\gamma(1 - 1/n) = z_n$, $\gamma(1) = a$, and γ is linear on the intervals $\left[1 - \frac{1}{n}, 1 - \frac{1}{(n+1)}\right]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It will suffice to show that there exists at most one point c in the interior of $C(\omega, a)$ such that $\omega(\gamma([0, 1])) \cap \{c + it: t \in [0, \varepsilon)\} = \emptyset$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Indeed, assume to the contrary that $c < c'$ are two such points. The set

$$K = \{c + it: t \in (0, 1)\} \cup \{c' + it: t \in (0, 1)\} \cup \{s + i, c \leq s \leq c'\}$$

separates $\mathbb{C}^+$ into two components, and the path $\omega(\gamma(t))$ contains infinitely many points in either of the components, hence it crosses K infinitely many times. By our assumption, crossings cannot be close to c or c' , and this implies the existence of a point in $C(\omega, a) \cap K \subset \mathbb{C}^+$, contradicting the hypothesis that $C(\omega, a) \cap \mathbb{C}^+ = \emptyset$. This proves our claim.

By Fatou's theorem (Theorem 1.5), the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))$ exists for almost all $c \in C(\omega, a)$. Denote it by $F_1(c)$. We shall prove that for every $c \in C(\omega, a)$, with at most three exceptions, $F_1(c) \notin \mathbb{C}^+$. Indeed, suppose that $F_1(c) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for some $c \in C(\omega, a)$, and assume that $\omega(z_n^{(c)})$ converges nontangentially to c . Then, using the relation $f(z, \omega(z)) = \omega(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, Remark 1.4, and the fact that F_2 is not a conformal self-map of $\mathbb{C}^+$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Im F_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Im F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Im F_2(F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) - \omega(z_n^{(c)}) + z_n^{(c)}) \\ &= \Im F_2(F_1(c) - c + a) \\ &> \Im(F_1(c) - c + a) \\ &= \Im F_1(c), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Assume that $c_0 \in \text{Int} C(\omega, a)$ is a point where F_1 does not continue meromorphically. Proposition 1.12 (b) shows that the set

$$E = \{c \in C(\omega, a): a + F_1(c) - c \in I_2\}$$

has nonzero Lebesgue measure. In particular, for all $c \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_2(F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) - \omega(z_n^{(c)}) + z_n^{(c)}) \\ &= F_2(F_1(c) - c + a), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the analiticity of F_2 on I_2 . Privalov's theorem implies that $F_1(z) = F_2(F_1(z) - z + a)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Rewriting this equality gives

$$F_2(F_1(z) - z + a) - (F_1(z) - z + a) + a = z,$$

or, equivalently,

$$u_2(u_1(z)) = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

contradicting the hypothesis.

We conclude that F_1 extends meromorphically through the whole interval $\text{Int}C(\omega, a)$. Let, as in the proof of Theorem 1.16, $\tilde{\omega}(z) = F_1(\omega(z)) - \omega(z) + z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We shall argue that the set $C(\tilde{\omega}, a) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ must be also infinite. Suppose this were not the case. Then for any $c \in \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow a} \tilde{\omega}(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) - \omega(z_n^{(c)}) + z_n^{(c)} = F_1(c) - c + a,$$

so that, by analytic continuation, $F_1(z) = z - a + \lim_{z \rightarrow a} \tilde{\omega}(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This contradicts the fact that F_1 is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. So $C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$ must be an infinite set. As before, F_2 must continue meromorphically through all of $\text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$.

By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})$ exists for every $c \in \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$, with at most one exception. Suppose there were a point $d \in C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$ and a set $V_d \subset \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$ of nonzero Lebesgue measure such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)}) = d$ for all $c \in V_d$. Taking limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the equality

$$F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) + z_n^{(c)} = \omega(z_n^{(c)}) + \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})$$

gives

$$F_1(c) + a = c + d, \quad \text{for all } c \in V_d.$$

Applying again Privalov's theorem, we obtain that $F_1(z) = z - (a - d)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This contradicts the fact that F_1 is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Thus, there exists a set $E \subseteq \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$ of positive Lebesgue measure such that $\{\tilde{c} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)}) : c \in E\} \subseteq \text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$. Then, since F_2 extends analytically through $\text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$, by (2) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_2(\tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_2\left(F_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) - \omega(z_n^{(c)}) + z_n^{(c)}\right) \\ &= F_2(a + F_1(c) - c) \end{aligned}$$

for all $c \in E$. Privalov's theorem implies that $F_1(z) = F_2(a + F_1(z) - z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. As we have proved already, this implies that u_1 and u_2 are conformal automorphisms of the upper half-plane, contradicting the hypothesis. This concludes the proof. $\square$

In the following, we prove subordination and regularity results for free additive convolutions of probability measures. We shall start by stating (without proof) some well-known fundamental facts.

Voiculescu [31] has showed that there exists an analogue of the logarithm of the Fourier transform for free additive convolution, called the R -transform. The R -transform is defined in terms of the inverse “near infinity” of the reciprocal of the Cauchy transform. For the proofs of the following results we refer to [10] and [36].

PROPOSITION 1.18. *Let μ be a probability on $\mathbb{R}$. There exists a nonempty domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^+$ of the form $\Omega = \cup_{\alpha > 0} \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta_\alpha}$ such that F_μ has a right inverse with respect to composition F_μ^{-1} defined on Ω . In addition, we have $\Im F_\mu^{-1}(z) \leq \Im z$ and*

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}} \frac{F_\mu^{-1}(z)}{z} = 1$$

for every $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

(We recall that $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta} = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \Im z > \beta, |\Re z| < \alpha \Im z\}$.) Let $\varphi_\mu(z) = F_\mu^{-1}(z) - z$, $z \in \Omega$. The basic property of the function φ_μ is described in the following theorem of Voiculescu:

THEOREM 1.19. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures supported on the real line. Then $\varphi_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = \varphi_\mu(z) + \varphi_\nu(z)$ for z in the common domain of the three functions.*

The function $R_\mu(z) = \varphi_\mu(1/z)$ is called the R -transform of the probability measure μ .

Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures, neither of them a point mass. Theorem 1.3 assures us that the functions $F_\mu = F_1$ and $F_\nu = F_2$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.16. With the notations from the proof of Theorem 1.16, denote $F_3(z) = F_1(\omega(z)) = F_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. By Theorem 1.3 and Proposition 1.18, there exists a cone $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}$ such that F_j , $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ have right inverses on $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}$ and $F_3^{-1}(\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$. Let us replace z in the relation

$$F_3(z) + z = \omega(z) + \tilde{\omega}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+$$

(equation (1.2)) by $F_3^{-1}(z)$. We obtain

$$z + F_3^{-1}(z) = \omega(F_3^{-1}(z)) + \tilde{\omega}(F_3^{-1}(z)) = F_1^{-1}(z) + F_2^{-1}(z),$$

or, equivalently,

$$F_3^{-1}(z) - z = \varphi_\mu(z) + \varphi_\nu(z), \quad z \in \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}.$$

By Theorem 1.19, we conclude that $F_3 = F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$.

This allows us to give a new proof for the subordination result of Biane [13] (see also [33], [34], and [35]).

COROLLARY 1.20. *Given two probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique pair of analytic functions $\omega_1, \omega_2: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = F_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = F_\nu(\omega_2(z))$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Moreover, $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega_j(iy)/iy = 1$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, and*

$$(3) \quad F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) + z = \omega_1(z) + \omega_2(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

PROOF. If one of the two measures, say μ is a point mass, $\mu = \delta_a$, then the statements of the corollary are obviously true, with $\omega_1(z) = z - a$ and $\omega_2(z) = F_\nu(z - a) + a$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Otherwise, as we have already seen, if we let $F_1 = F_\mu$ and $F_2 = F_\nu$ in Theorem 1.16, the

functions $\omega_1 = \omega$ and $\omega_2 = \tilde{\omega}$ will satisfy the requirement of the Corollary. Uniqueness is guaranteed by Theorem 1.16, while the equation (3) has been established before. $\square$

Next, we use the boundary properties of the subordination functions shown in Theorem 1.17 to describe the atomic, singular continuous, and absolutely continuous parts, with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$, of the free convolution $\mu \boxplus \nu$ of two probability measures μ, ν on the real line. Given a finite measure σ on $\mathbb{R}$, denote by σ^{ac} , σ^{sc} , and σ^p the absolutely continuous, singular continuous, respectively atomic, parts of σ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The following lemma describes the behaviour of the Cauchy transform G_μ near points belonging to the support of the singular continuous part of the probability measure μ . The result is not new, but since we don't know a reference, we shall give its proof.

LEMMA 1.21. *Let μ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. For μ^{sc} -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the nontangential limit of the Cauchy transform G_μ of μ at x is infinite.*

PROOF. It is enough to show that for μ^{sc} -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the imaginary part of $G_\mu(x + iy)$ tends to infinity as y approaches zero. An elementary calculation shows that, for any $y > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Im G_\mu(x + iy) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{y}{(x - t)^2 + y^2} d\mu(t).$$

Let us observe that $\frac{y}{(x-t)^2 + y^2} \geq \frac{1}{2y}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|x - t| \leq y$. Thus, for any given $y > 0$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Im G_\mu(x + iy) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{y}{(x - t)^2 + y^2} d\mu(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{2y} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{2y^2}{(x - t)^2 + y^2} d\mu(t) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2y} \int_{x-y}^{x+y} \frac{2y^2}{(x - t)^2 + y^2} d\mu(t) \\ &\geq \frac{\mu^{sc}((x - y, x + y])}{2y}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply de la Vallée Poussin's theorem ([28], Theorem 9.6) to conclude that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu^{sc}((x - y, x + y])}{2y} = \infty$ for μ^{sc} -almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. (see also [14], Theorem 31.6) $\square$

We shall first take care of the particular case not covered by Theorem 1.17.

PROPOSITION 1.22. *Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures on the real line, neither of them a point mass. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and define $u_\mu(z) = F_\mu(z) - z + a$, $u_\nu(z) = F_\nu(z) - z + a$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The function $u_\mu \circ u_\nu$ is a conformal automorphism of the upper half-plane if and only if μ and ν are convex combinations of two point masses. Moreover, in this case, $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{sc} = 0$, and the density of $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure is analytic everywhere, with the exception of at most four points.*

PROOF. We claim that the analytic functions $u_\mu, u_\nu: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$, are both conformal automorphisms of the upper half-plane. Indeed, observe first that both u_ν and u_μ are nonconstant, by Remark 1.4. Let k be the inverse with respect to composition of $u_\mu \circ u_\nu$, so that

$$u_\mu(u_\nu(k(z))) = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

This implies that u_ν is injective. Applying u_ν to both sides of the above equality, we conclude that $u_\nu(u_\mu(w)) = w$ for all w in the open subset $(u_\nu \circ k)(\mathbb{C}^+)$ of the upper half-plane, so, by analytic continuation, for all $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This proves surjectivity of u_ν and thus our claim is proved.

Since

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{u_\mu(iy)}{iy} = 0,$$

we conclude that there exist $p, q, r \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} p & q \\ 1 & r \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad u_\mu(z) = \frac{pz + q}{z + r}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Modulo a translation of μ and ν , we may assume that $a = 0$. This implies that

$$F_\mu(z) = \frac{z^2 + z(p+r) + q}{z+r},$$

and thus μ is the convex combination of two point masses, at

$$\frac{-p-r + \sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{-p-r - \sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}}{2}$$

with weights

$$\frac{r - p + \sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}}{2\sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p - r + \sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}}{2\sqrt{(p+r)^2 - 4q}}$$

respectively. A similar statement holds for ν .

Conversely, if $\nu = t\delta_u + (1-t)\delta_v$, then a direct computation shows that $F_\nu(z) = (z-v)(z-u)(z-tv-(1-t)u)^{-1}$, so that

$$u_\nu(z) = \frac{-(tu + (1-t)v)z + uv}{z - (tv + (1-t)u)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

and

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} -tu - (1-t)v & uv \\ 1 & -tv - (1-t)u \end{bmatrix} = t(1-t)(u-v)^2 > 0,$$

for all $0 < t < 1, u \neq v$. This proves the first statement of the proposition.

Assume now that $\mu = s\delta_\alpha + (1-s)\delta_u$ and $\nu = t\delta_\beta + (1-t)\delta_v$, with $0 < s, t < 1$, and $\alpha, u, \beta, v \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha \neq u, \beta \neq v$. Modulo a translation, we may assume that $\alpha = \beta = 0$, and $u, v > 0$. Thus, we just need to compute $(s\delta_0 + (1-s)\delta_u) \boxplus (t\delta_0 + (1-t)\delta_v)$. As we have seen before,

$$F_\mu(z) = \frac{z^2 - zu}{z - su}, \quad F_\nu(z) = \frac{z^2 - zv}{z - tv}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

From equation (2), we conclude that $\omega_1(z)$ must satisfy the equation

$$F_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = F_\nu(F_\mu(\omega_1(z)) - \omega_1(z) + z),$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega_1(z)^2 - \omega_1(z)u}{\omega_1(z) - su} = & \frac{\left(\frac{\omega_1(z)^2 - \omega_1(z)u}{\omega_1(z) - su} - \omega_1(z) + z \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\omega_1(z)^2 - \omega_1(z)u}{\omega_1(z) - su} - \omega_1(z) + z \right)v}{\frac{\omega_1(z)^2 - \omega_1(z)u}{\omega_1(z) - su} - \omega_1(z) + z - tv} \end{aligned}$$

Solving for ω_1 gives as possible solutions

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{-z^2 + z(u(1-2s) + v) + uv(s+t-1)}{2(z-tv-(1-s)u)} \\ & - \frac{\pm \sqrt{[z(z-u-v) + uv(1-s-t)]^2 + 4stuvz(z-u-v)}}{2(z-tv-(1-s)u)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega_1(iy)/iy = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1(z) = & \frac{z^2 - z(u(1 - 2s) + v) - uv(s + t - 1)}{2(z - tv - (1 - s)u)} \\ & + \frac{\sqrt{[z(z - u - v) + uv(1 - s - t)]^2 + 4stuvz(z - u - v)}}{2(z - tv - (1 - s)u)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. By relation (2),

$$G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = G_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = \frac{s}{\omega_1(z)} + \frac{1 - s}{\omega_1(z) - u}.$$

The only points where $G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$ may fail to extend analytically to $\mathbb{R}$ are the zeros of the equation

$$[z(z - u - v) + uv(1 - s - t)]^2 + 4stuvz(z - u - v) = 0$$

(i.e. when the expression under the square root sign is zero), and the zeros of the equations

$$\begin{aligned} [z^2 - z(u(1 - 2s) + v) - uv(s + t - 1)]^2 = \\ [z(z - u - v) + uv(1 - s - t)]^2 + 4stuvz(z - u - v), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} [z^2 - z(u(1 - 2s) + v) - uv(s + t - 1) - 2u(z - tv - (1 - s)u)]^2 = \\ [z(z - u - v) + uv(1 - s - t)]^2 + 4stuvz(z - u - v), \end{aligned}$$

which occur at the denominator of $G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$. We have used Maple to determine that the four solutions for the first equation (denote them by $r_j, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$) are

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(u + v \pm \sqrt{(u - v)^2 + 4uv(t + s - 2st) \pm 8uv\sqrt{ts(1 - t)(1 - s)}} \right).$$

Whether all four of these roots are distinct or not depends on the actual values of s, t, u, v . However, it is trivial to observe that they are all real; indeed, $u, v > 0$ by hypothesis, and an elementary computation shows that $t + s - 2st > 0$ and $t + s - 2st \geq 2\sqrt{ts(1 - t)(1 - s)}$, with equality if and only if $s = t$. Notice also that it is not possible that exactly three of the roots are distinct. Also by using Maple, we have determined that the second and third equations have as solutions the numbers $0, v, (1 - s)u + tv$, and $u, u + v, (1 - s)u + tv$,

respectively. We can thus write (with the help of Maple):

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = & \frac{z^2 - z(u(1 - 2s) + v) - uv(s + t - 1) - \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^4 (z - r_j)}}{2uz(z - v)} \\
& - \frac{z^2 - z((3 - 2s)u + v) + uv(t - s + 1) + 2u^2(1 - s)}{2u(z - u)(z - u - v)} \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^4 (z - r_j)}}{2u(z - u)(z - u - v)}.
\end{aligned}$$

As it can be seen from the above formula, the support of $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}$ coincides with the set where the product $\prod_{j=1}^4 (z - r_j)$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$, is negative, and, since $G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$ can be infinite only at the points $0, u, v, u + v$, the measure $\mu \boxplus \nu$ has at most four atoms, which may occur exactly in $0, u, v$, or $u + v$. This concludes the proof. $\square$

We can now prove the main regularity result of this section.

THEOREM 1.23. *Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures on the real line, neither of them a point mass. Then the following statements hold:*

- (1) *The point $a \in \mathbb{R}$ is an atom of the measure $\mu \boxplus \nu$ if and only if there exist $b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a = b + c$ and $\mu(\{b\}) + \nu(\{c\}) > 1$. Moreover, $(\mu \boxplus \nu)(\{a\}) = \mu(\{b\}) + \nu(\{c\}) - 1$.*
- (2) *The absolutely continuous part of $\mu \boxplus \nu$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure is always nonzero and its density is locally analytic on the complement of a closed set of zero Lebesgue measure.*
- (3) *Assume in addition that $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is compact and $\mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}(\nu)$ is nonempty. Then the singular continuous part of $\mu \boxplus \nu$ is zero.*

PROOF. Part (1) of the theorem is due to Bercovici and Voiculescu (see [12], Theorem 7.4). We shall proceed with the proof of part (2). Suppose that $\mu \boxplus \nu$ is purely singular, and thus for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure, we have

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \Im F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \Im G_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy) = 0.$$

By part (1), we are assured that $\mu \boxplus \nu$ cannot be purely atomic, so we must have $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{sc} \neq 0$, and hence, by Lemma 1.21, $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy) = 0$ for uncountably many $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Theorem 1.10 applied to the function $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$ yields a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $C(F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}, x_0) = \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$. Using relation (3) we conclude that at least one of $C(\omega_1, x_0), C(\omega_2, x_0)$, will intersect the upper half-plane. (Recall that ω_1, ω_2 are the subordination functions from Corollary 1.20.) But now we can apply Theorem 1.17 (1) and Proposition 1.22 to obtain a contradiction. Thus, $\mu \boxplus \nu$ cannot be purely singular.

Next we prove that there exists a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}$ of zero Lebesgue measure on whose complement the density $f(x) = \frac{d(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}(x)}{dx}$ is analytic. By Theorem 1.5, there exists a subset E of $\mathbb{R}$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus E$ the limits $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy)$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_j(x + iy)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ exist and are finite. Also, for almost all $x \in \text{supp}((\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}) \setminus E$, with respect to $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}$, we have $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy) \in \mathbb{C}^+$. By relation (3), at least one of $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_j(x + iy)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, must also be in $\mathbb{C}^+$. For definiteness, assume $\omega_1(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_1(x + iy) \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Part (1) of Theorem 1.17 and Proposition 1.22 assure us that ω_1 extends analytically through x . Since $\omega_1(x) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, the function $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu} = F_\mu \circ \omega_1$ also extends analytically through x . We conclude that the density of $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}$ must be analytic in x . On the other hand, if there exists an interval $J \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \text{supp}((\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac})$, then $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \Im F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x + iy) = 0$ for almost all $x \in J$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The same argument used in the proof of the existence of an absolutely continuous part of $\mu \boxplus \nu$ shows that $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$ extends meromorphically through J . Of course, the set A of points x where $f(x) = \frac{d(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{ac}(x)}{dx}$ is analytic is open in $\mathbb{R}$, and its complement is of zero Lebesgue measure.

To prove (3), observe that our hypotheses on the supports of μ and ν allow us to apply either part (2) of Theorem 1.17, or Proposition 1.22 to conclude that the subordination functions ω_1 and ω_2 extend continuously to $\mathbb{R}$ as functions with values in the extended complex plane $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$. By relation (3), the same must hold for $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}$. We shall denote by the same symbols the continuous extensions of the three functions to $\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$.

Let us assume that $(\mu \boxplus \nu)^{sc} \neq 0$. Lemma 1.21 allows us to find an uncountable set $H \subseteq \text{supp}((\mu \boxplus \nu)^{sc})$ such that no $x \in H$ is an atom of $\mu \boxplus \nu$, and

$$\lim_{\substack{z \rightarrow x \\ \triangleleft}} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow x} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = 0.$$

We claim that for any $x \in H$

- (i) $\omega_1(x), \omega_2(x) \neq \infty$,
- (ii) $\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow \omega_1(x)} F_\mu(z) = \triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow \omega_2(x)} F_\nu(z) = 0$,
- (iii) $\mu(\{\omega_1(x)\}) + \nu(\{\omega_2(x)\}) = 1$.

Part (i) is an easy consequence of Theorems 1.3 and 1.6. Indeed, by Theorem 1.3, we have that $\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} F_\mu(z) = \infty$. Assume that $\omega_1(x) = \infty$. Then, by our assumption on x , Corollary 1.20, and Theorem 1.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{z \rightarrow x} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) \\ &= \lim_{z \rightarrow x} F_\mu(\omega_1(z)) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow \infty \\ w \in \omega_1(x+i(0,1))}} F_\mu(w) \\ &= \lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow \infty \\ \triangleleft}} F_\mu(w) \\ &= \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which is absurd. A similar argument shows that $\omega_2(x) \neq \infty$.

By Theorem 1.6, we have

$$\lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow \omega_1(x) \\ \triangleleft}} F_\mu(w) = \lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow \omega_1(x) \\ w \in \omega_1(x+i(0,1))}} F_\mu(w) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} F_\mu(\omega_1(x+iy)) = \lim_{z \rightarrow x} F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) = 0.$$

The same argument applied to F_ν and ω_2 in place of F_μ and ω_1 yields $\triangleleft \lim_{w \rightarrow \omega_2(x)} F_\nu(w) = 0$. This proves part (ii) of our claim.

We prove now part (iii). Observe first that, by dominated convergence and by Theorem 1.13 applied to self-maps of $\mathbb{C}^+$, for any $v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\triangleleft \lim_{z \rightarrow v} F_\mu(z) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\mu(\{v\})} &= \lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]{\rightarrow} v} \left[(z - v) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(t)}{z - t} \right]^{-1} \\ &= \lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]{\rightarrow} v} \frac{F_\mu(z)}{z - v} \\ &= \liminf_{z \rightarrow v} \frac{\Im F_\mu(z)}{\Im z}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this to $v = \omega_1(x)$ yields

$$\frac{1}{\mu(\{\omega_1(x)\})} = \liminf_{z \rightarrow \omega_1(x)} \frac{\Im F_\mu(z)}{\Im z} \leq \liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im F_\mu(\omega_1(z))}{\Im \omega_1(z)},$$

and similarly

$$\frac{1}{\nu(\{\omega_2(x)\})} \leq \liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im F_\nu(\omega_2(z))}{\Im \omega_2(z)},$$

for all $x \in H$ (we use here the convention $1/0 = +\infty$).

From relation (3) we obtain

$$\frac{\Im F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z)}{\Im \omega_1(z)} + \frac{\Im z}{\Im \omega_1(z)} - 1 = \frac{\Im \omega_2(z)}{\Im \omega_1(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

The following chain of inequalities holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\nu(\{\omega_2(x)\})} - 1 &\leq \liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im F_\nu(\omega_2(z))}{\Im \omega_2(z)} - 1 \\ &\leq \limsup_{z \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{\Im F_\nu(\omega_2(z))}{\Im \omega_2(z)} + \frac{\Im z}{\Im \omega_2(z)} - 1 \right) \\ &= \limsup_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im \omega_1(z)}{\Im \omega_2(z)} \\ &= \left(\liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im \omega_2(z)}{\Im \omega_1(z)} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(\liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \left(\frac{\Im F_\mu(\omega_1(z))}{\Im \omega_1(z)} + \frac{\Im z}{\Im \omega_1(z)} \right) - 1 \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq \left(\liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im F_\mu(\omega_1(z))}{\Im \omega_1(z)} + \liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im z}{\Im \omega_1(z)} - 1 \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq \left(\liminf_{z \rightarrow x} \frac{\Im F_\mu(\omega_1(z))}{\Im \omega_1(z)} - 1 \right)^{-1} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\mu(\{\omega_1(z)\})} - 1 \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have assumed that μ and ν are not point masses, so the above implies that $1 < \frac{1}{\mu(\{\omega_1(z)\})}, \frac{1}{\nu(\{\omega_2(z)\})} < +\infty$. Thus, multiplying the above inequality by $\frac{1}{\mu(\{\omega_1(z)\})} - 1$ will give

$$(1 - \mu(\{\omega_1(x)\}))(1 - \nu(\{\omega_2(x)\})) \leq \mu(\{\omega_1(x)\})\nu(\{\omega_2(x)\}),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\mu(\{\omega_1(x)\}) + \nu(\{\omega_2(x)\}) \geq 1.$$

Since $x \in H$, part (1) of the theorem tells us that the inequality above must be an equality.

This proves the last point of our claim.

Using relation (3) and the fact that $F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(x) = 0$, we obtain

$$\omega_1(x) + \omega_2(x) = x \quad \text{for all } x \in H.$$

Since any probability can have at most countably many atoms, this, together with part (iii) of our claim contradicts the fact that H is uncountable and concludes the proof. $\square$

2. Regularity for the free multiplicative convolution of probability measures on the positive half-line

Let σ be a finite Borel measure on $[0, +\infty)$. We define the analytic function

$$\psi_\sigma(z) = \int_{[0, +\infty)} \frac{zt}{1 - zt} d\sigma(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty).$$

The function ψ_σ is called the moment generating function of σ . A simple computation shows that $G_\sigma(1/z) = z(\psi_\sigma(z) + \sigma([0, +\infty)))$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. Using this formula, one can prove the following analogue of Theorem 1.1 for measures supported on the positive half-line (see [10], Proposition 6.1).

PROPOSITION 1.24. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function such that $\psi(\bar{z}) = \overline{\psi(z)}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. The following two conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a finite measure σ on $[0, +\infty)$ such that $\psi = \psi_\sigma$.*
- (2) *$\lim_{y \uparrow 0} \psi(y) = 0$ and there exists a number $C > 0$ such that $z(\psi(z) + C) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.*

Moreover, $C = \sigma([0, +\infty))$.

Observe in particular that, unless σ is concentrated at zero, we have $0 \notin \psi_\sigma(\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty))$, $\psi_\sigma((-\infty, 0)) \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$, and $\psi_\sigma(\mathbb{C}^+) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$. For analytic functions ψ satisfying these three conditions it is possible to define a continuous function $\arg \psi : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\exp(i \arg \psi(z)) = \psi(z)/|\psi(z)|$, and $\arg \psi = \pi$ on the negative half-line. We will also consider the limit $\psi(0-) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0, z < 0} \psi(z)$. Observe that $\psi(0-)$ exists if $\psi(\mathbb{C}^+) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$. In this case it is easy to see that $\psi'(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (-\infty, 0)$; indeed, if $z < 0$, $\psi'(z)$ is a real number so that

$$\psi'(z) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \Re \frac{\psi(z + iy) - \psi(z)}{iy} = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{\Im \psi(z + iy)}{y} \geq 0,$$

and $\psi'(z) = 0$ would imply that the image under ψ of a small half-disk $\{w : \Im w > 0, |w - z| < \varepsilon\}$ contains numbers in $-\mathbb{C}^+$. An immediate consequence of this fact is that the function ψ_σ defined above never takes the value $-\sigma([0, +\infty))$.

Let now μ be a probability measure on $[0, +\infty)$. It will be convenient to consider the function

$$\eta_\mu(z) = \frac{\psi_\mu(z)}{1 + \psi_\mu(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty).$$

An analogue of Theorem 1.2 for the function η_μ is the following proposition (see [5], Proposition 2.1).

PROPOSITION 1.25. *Let $\eta : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ be an analytic function such that $\eta(\bar{z}) = \overline{\eta(z)}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. The following two conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure $\mu \neq \delta_0$ on $[0, +\infty)$ such that $\eta = \eta_\mu$.*
- (2) *$\eta(0-) = 0$ and $\arg \eta(z) \in [\arg z, \pi)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.*

Moreover, $\mu \neq \delta_0$ is a point mass if and only if there exists a $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $\arg \eta_\mu(z) = \arg z$.

PROOF. Observe first that, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, the set

$$C_z = \left\{ \frac{tz}{1 - tz} : t > 0 \right\}$$

is a circular arc contained in $\mathbb{C}^+$, with endpoints 0 and -1 , and tangent to the line $\{tz : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Thus, given $\mu \neq \delta_0$, $\psi_\mu(z)$ will belong to the convex hull $\text{co}(C_z)$, and therefore

$$\eta_\mu(z) \in \left\{ \frac{w}{w+1} : w \in \text{co}(C_z) \right\}.$$

This last set is precisely $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \arg \lambda \geq \arg z\}$, and we conclude that η_μ satisfies the conditions in (2). Conversely, assume that η satisfies (2), and set $\psi = \eta/(1 - \eta)$, so that $\eta = \psi/(1 + \psi)$. For $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ we have then $\eta(z) \in \{w/(1 + w) : w \in \text{co}(C_z)\}$, and thus $\psi(z) \in \text{co}(C_z)$. Thus $1 + \psi(z) \in 1 + \text{co}(C_z)$ which implies that $1 + \psi(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and $\arg(1 + \psi(z)) > -\arg z$ (by the symmetry of C_z about the line $x = -1/2$). We conclude that $z(1 + \psi(z)) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and the result follows from the preceding proposition.

If $\mu = \delta_a$ for some $a \in (0, +\infty)$, then $\eta_\mu(z) = az$, so $\arg \eta_\mu(z) = \arg z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Assume that $\arg \eta_\mu(z_0) = \arg z_0$ for some z_0 in the upper half-plane. Then $\arg \psi_\mu(z_0)/(1 + \psi_\mu(z_0)) = \arg z_0$, so we conclude that there exists a number $\ell \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $\psi_\mu(z_0)/(1 + \psi_\mu(z_0)) = \ell z_0$, or, equivalently,

$$\psi_\mu(z_0) = \frac{\ell z_0}{1 - \ell z_0}.$$

We conclude that $\psi_\mu(z_0) \in C_{z_0}$, and thus $\mu = \delta_\ell$. □

REMARK 1.26. An immediate consequence of the definition of η_μ and of Proposition 1.24 is that for any $\mu \neq \delta_0$, $\eta_\mu((-\infty, 0)) \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$, and thus, as shown before, $\eta_\mu|_{(-\infty, 0)}$ is injective.

Next we prove a subordination result for analytic self-maps of the slit complex plane.

THEOREM 1.27. *Let $\eta_j : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ be two analytic functions satisfying conditions*

- (a) $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0, x < 0} \eta_j(x) = 0$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$;
- (b) $\pi > \arg \eta_j(z) > \arg z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$;
- (c) $\eta_j(\bar{z}) = \overline{\eta_j(z)}$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

Define $h_j : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $h_j(z) = \frac{\eta_j(z)}{z}$, and let $f : (\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$f(z, w) = h_2(zh_1(zw)).$$

Then

- (1) The function f is well-defined and takes values in $\mathbb{C}^+$.
- (2) There exists a unique analytic self-map h of $\mathbb{C}^+$ such that $f(z, h(z)) = h(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

PROOF. We start by proving (1). It follows from (b) and (c) that the functions h_j map the upper half-plane into itself, $h_j(\bar{z}) = \overline{h_j(z)}$, and $h_j((-\infty, 0)) \subset (0, +\infty)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus, if $z \in (0, +\infty)$ it is obvious that $f(z, w)$ is well defined and takes values in $\mathbb{C}^+$. If $z \in (-\infty, 0)$, then $h_1(zw) \in -\mathbb{C}^+$, so that $zh_1(zw) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and we conclude again that $f(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

Let now $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. If $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$ is such that $\arg(zw) \leq \pi$, then

$$\arg zh_1(zw) = \arg z + \arg \eta_1(zw) - \arg(zw) \geq \arg z > 0,$$

and

$$\arg zh_1(zw) = \arg z + \arg \eta_1(zw) - \arg(zw) < \pi - \arg w < \pi.$$

If $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$ is such that $\arg(zw) > \pi$, then, using (b) and (c), we have

$$\arg \eta_1(zw) = 2\pi - \arg \overline{\eta_1(zw)} = 2\pi - \arg \eta_1(\overline{zw}) < 2\pi - \arg(\overline{zw}) = \arg(zw),$$

so

$$\arg zh_1(zw) = \arg \eta_1(wz) - \arg w < \arg(wz) - \arg w = \arg z < \pi,$$

and

$$\arg zh_1(zw) = \arg \eta_1(zw) - \arg w > \pi - \arg w > 0,$$

by (c). We conclude that $zh_1(zw) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for all $(z, w) \in (\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{C}^+$, and thus f is well defined and its range is included in the upper half-plane.

We prove now (2). For each $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ denote $f_z: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$, $f_z(w) = f(z, w)$. We claim that f_z must have its Denjoy-Wolff point in $\mathbb{C}^+$.

Indeed, for any $r \in (0, +\infty)$, $\lim_{w \rightarrow r} f(z, w) = h_2(zh_1(rz)) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, so r cannot be a fixed point of f_z , so the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z does not belong to the interval $(0, +\infty)$.

Assume now that zero is the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z . Then, by the definition of the Denjoy-Wolff point, we have $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} f_z(iy) = 0$, and $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy}$ must belong to $(0, 1]$. But

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{h_2(z h_1(ziy))}{h_1(ziy)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right)}{\eta_1(ziy)}.$$

By Theorem 1.13, $r = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}$ exists in $(0, +\infty) \cup \{\infty\}$.

If $r \in (0, +\infty)$, then $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right) = \eta_2(rz)$, so, using (a) together with Theorem 1.6, we obtain $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \frac{\eta_2(rz)}{0} = \infty$, which contradicts the fact that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} \in (0, 1]$.

We conclude that r must be infinity. Since, by property (b), we have $\arg\left(z \frac{\eta_1(zw)}{zw}\right) \in (\arg z, \pi + \arg z)$ for any $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we obtain

$$\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right) = \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \eta_2(x) \in [-\infty, 0),$$

by Theorem 1.6 and the monotonicity of $\eta_2|_{(-\infty, 0)}$. Property (a) yields again $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \infty$, which contradicts the fact that $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} \in (0, 1]$. We conclude that zero is not the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z .

Suppose that f_z has infinity as its Denjoy-Wolff point. Then we must have

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} f_z(iy) = \infty, \text{ and } \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} \geq 1.$$

However,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right)}{\eta_1(ziy)}.$$

Theorem 1.13 assures us that $l = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy} \in [0, +\infty)$. If $l > 0$, then we have $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right) = \eta_2(zl)$, so

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right)}{\eta_1(ziy)} = \frac{\eta_2(zl)}{\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_1(ziy)} = 0,$$

a contradiction. If $l = 0$, then, by Theorem 1.6, the limit

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right),$$

if it exists, must equal zero. Since

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(ziy)}{z iy}\right)}{\eta_1(ziy)}$$

and, by Theorem 1.6, $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_1(zy) = \lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} \eta_1(z) < 0$, we conclude that

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{f_z(iy)}{iy} = 0.$$

Thus, infinity cannot be the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z .

We still need to show that no point on the negative half-line is the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z . Suppose to the contrary that

$$\lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow r \\ \triangleleft}} f_z(w) = r$$

for some $r < 0$. As we have already seen,

$$\lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow r \\ \triangleleft}} h_1(zw) = \lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow r \\ \triangleleft}} \frac{\eta_1(zw)}{zw} = \frac{\eta_1(zr)}{zr} \in -\mathbb{C}^+,$$

so

$$\lim_{\substack{w \rightarrow r \\ \triangleleft}} f_z(w) = h_2\left(\frac{1}{r}\eta_1(zr)\right) \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Thus r cannot be a fixed point of f_z . This proved our claim.

Let $h(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ denote the Denjoy-Wolff point of f_z . Since we have shown in part (1) that on the one hand $f_z(r)$ takes values in the upper half-plane for any $r > 0$, and on the other $f_z((-\infty, 0)) \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$, we conclude that f_z is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Thus, Theorem 1.14 assures us that the derivative of f_z in the point $h(z)$ has absolute value strictly less than one, $|f'_z(h(z))| < 1$. By applying the implicit function theorem to the function $(z, w) \mapsto f(z, w) - w$, we conclude that $h(z)$ depends analytically on z . Thus, we have determined the existence of ω . The uniqueness follows immediately from the uniqueness of the Denjoy-Wolff point. This proves part (2) of the theorem. $\square$

COROLLARY 1.28. *Let η_j , $j \in \{1, 2\}$, be two analytic functions as in Theorem 1.27. Then there exists a unique analytic function*

$$\omega: \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$$

such that

$$\omega(z) = \frac{\omega(z)\eta_2\left(z\frac{\eta_1(\omega(z))}{\omega(z)}\right)}{\eta_1(\omega(z))}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty).$$

Moreover, $\arg z < \arg \omega(z) < \pi$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

PROOF. With the notations from Theorem 1.27, let $\omega(z) = zh(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. It is clear that $\arg \omega(z) > \arg z$ for all numbers z in the upper half-plane. Using the relation $f(z, h(z)) = h(z)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(z) &= zf(z, h(z)) \\ &= zh_2(zh_1(zh(z))) \\ &= z \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(h(z))}{\omega(z)}\right)}{z \frac{\eta_1(\omega(z))}{\omega(z)}} \\ &= \frac{\omega(z) \eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(\omega(z))}{\omega(z)}\right)}{\eta_1(\omega(z))}. \end{aligned}$$

The above equality holds for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We conclude that $\omega(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and $\arg \omega(z) > \arg z$.

Denote $A_z = \{w \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \arg w > \arg z\}$, and observe that $\omega(z)$ is a fixed point for the function

$$g_z : A_z \longrightarrow A_z, \quad g_z(w) = w \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}\right)}{\eta_1(w)}.$$

Since the functions η_j satisfy the condition (b) from Theorem 1.27, the function g_z cannot be the identity function. By the Denjoy-Wolff theorem (Theorem 1.14), we obtain the uniqueness of ω .

Since h extends continuously to the negative half-line, it is now obvious that so does ω . By the Schwarz reflection principle, we can extend ω to the whole $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, and its range will be included in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. This concludes the proof. $\square$

As in the first section, let us observe that Theorem 1.27 and Corollary 1.28 provide an analytic function $\tilde{\omega} : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, $\tilde{\omega}(z) = z\eta_1(\omega(z))/\omega(z)$, satisfying the conditions

$$\tilde{\omega}(z) = \frac{\tilde{\omega}(z) \eta_1\left(z \frac{\eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))}{\tilde{\omega}(z)}\right)}{\eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty),$$

and $\arg \tilde{\omega}(z) > \arg z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The pair of functions $(\omega, \tilde{\omega})$ is uniquely determined by the equations

$$(4) \quad \eta_1(\omega(z)) = \eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) = \frac{1}{z} \omega(z) \tilde{\omega}(z)$$

We record here for later use the form of equations 4 in terms of the functions $\psi = \eta/(1 - \eta)$:

$$(5) \quad \psi_1(\omega(z)) = \psi_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) = \frac{\omega(z)\tilde{\omega}(z)}{z - \omega(z)\tilde{\omega}(z)}$$

In the following theorem we shall describe the boundary behavior of the functions ω and $\tilde{\omega}$.

THEOREM 1.29. *Let η_1, η_2, f and ω be as in Corollary 1.28, and consider their restrictions to $\mathbb{C}^+$. Fix a point $a \in (0, +\infty)$ and define the following two self-maps of the upper half-plane: $u_j(z) = a\eta_j(z)/z$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Assume that $u_2 \circ u_1$ is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Then:*

- (1) *If $C(\omega, a) \cap \mathbb{C}^+ \neq \emptyset$, then the function ω extends analytically in a neighbourhood of a .*
- (2) *The limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow a} \omega(z)$ exists in $\mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.*

PROOF. We shall prove (1) by showing that the function h extends analytically through a . Let z_n be a sequence converging to a such that $a\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$ belongs to the upper half-plane. We have:

$$\ell = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(z_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(z_n, h(z_n)) = f(a, \ell) = f_a(\ell),$$

so ℓ is a fixed point of f_a belonging to $\mathbb{C}^+$. If f_a is not a conformal automorphism of the upper half-plane, then the implicit function argument used in the proof of part (2) of Theorem 1.27 implies that there exists a neighbourhood of a in $\mathbb{C}$ on which h , and hence ω , extends analytically.

If $f_a(\cdot)$ is a conformal automorphism of the upper half-plane, denote by k its inverse. Consider u_j , $j = 1, 2$, as in the statement of the theorem. The equality

$$w = f_a(k(w)) = h_2(ah_1(ak(w)))$$

is equivalent to

$$u_2(u_1(ak(w))) = aw, \quad w \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

We conclude that $u_1 \circ k$ (and hence u_1) must be injective. Let $l(w) = ak(a^{-1}w)$, $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$, so that $u_2(u_1(l(w))) = w$. By applying $u_1 \circ l$ to the above equality, we obtain

$$u_1(l(u_2(z))) = z, \text{ for all } z \in (u_1 \circ l)(\mathbb{C}^+).$$

Since $(u_1 \circ l)(\mathbb{C}^+)$ is open, the above equality must be true for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, allowing us to conclude that u_1 is also surjective, so a conformal automorphism. But then $u_2 \circ u_1$ must also be a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. This contradicts the hypothesis.

We now prove part (2) of the theorem. Assume that $C(\omega, a)$ contains more than one point. By part (1), we must have $C(\omega, a) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, and, by Lemma 1.9, either $C(\omega, a) \setminus \{\infty\}$ is a closed interval in $\mathbb{R}$, or $\mathbb{R} \setminus C(\omega, a)$ is an open interval in $\mathbb{R}$.

As we have shown in the proof of Theorem 1.17 (2), for any $c \in C(\omega, a) \setminus \{\infty\}$, with the possible exception of three points, there exists a sequence $\{z_n^{(c)}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to a such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n^{(c)}) = c$ and $\Re \omega(z_n^{(c)}) = c$ for all n . By Theorem 1.5, the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))$ exists for almost all $c \in C(\omega, a)$. Denote it by $\eta_1(c)$. We claim that for any $c \in C(\omega, a)$, with at most three exceptions, $\eta_1(c) \notin \mathbb{C}^+$. Indeed, suppose that $\eta_1(c) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for some $c \in C(\omega, a)$, and assume that there exists a sequence $z_n^{(c)}$ such that $\omega(z_n^{(c)})$ converges nontangentially to c . Then, using (4) and the fact that $\arg \eta_j(z) > \arg z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \eta_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \arg \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \arg \eta_2 \left(\frac{z_n^{(c)} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))}{\omega(z_n^{(c)})} \right) \\ &= \arg \eta_2 \left(\frac{a \eta_1(c)}{c} \right) \\ &> \arg \left(\frac{a \eta_1(c)}{c} \right) \\ &= \arg \eta_1(c), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction.

Assume that $c_0 \in \text{Int} C(\omega, a)$ is a point where η_1 does not continue meromorphically. Proposition 1.12 (b) shows that the set

$$E = \{c \in C(\omega, a) : a \eta_1(c)/c \in (-\infty, 0)\}$$

has nonzero Lebesgue measure. In particular, for all $c \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_2 \left(\frac{z_n^{(c)} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))}{\omega(z_n^{(c)})} \right) \\ &= \eta_2 \left(\frac{a\eta_1(c)}{c} \right).\end{aligned}$$

By analytic continuation, this implies that $\eta_1(z) = \eta_2(a\eta_1(z)/z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Rewriting this equality gives

$$a\eta_2 \left(\frac{a\eta_1(z)}{z} \right) \frac{z}{a\eta_1(z)} = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

or, equivalently,

$$u_2(u_1(z)) = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

In particular, $u_2 \circ u_1$ is an automorphism of the upper half-plane, contradicting the hypothesis.

We conclude that η_1 must extend meromorphically through the set $\text{Int}C(\omega, a)$. Let $\tilde{\omega}(z) = z\eta_1(\omega(z))/\omega(z)$. We shall argue that the set $C(\tilde{\omega}, a) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ must also be infinite. Indeed, suppose this were not the case. Then, for any $c \in \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$, with at most one exception,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow a} \tilde{\omega}(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{z_n^{(c)} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))}{\omega(z_n^{(c)})} = \frac{a\eta_1(c)}{c},$$

so, by analytic continuation, $\eta_1(z) = z \lim_{z \rightarrow a} \tilde{\omega}(z)/a$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This contradicts the hypothesis that $\arg \eta_1(z) > \arg z$ for all z in the upper half-plane. So $C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$ is an infinite set. As before, η_2 must continue meromorphically through all of $\text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$.

By passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})$ exists for every $c \in \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$, with at most one exception. Suppose there were a point $d \in C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$ and a set $V_d \subset \text{Int}C(\omega, a)$ of nonzero Lebesgue measure such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)}) = d$ for all $c \in V_d$. Taking limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the equality

$$z_n^{(c)} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) = \omega(z_n^{(c)}) \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})$$

gives

$$a\eta_1(c) = cd, \quad \text{for all } c \in V_d.$$

We conclude by Theorem 1.7 that $\eta_1(z) = (d/a)z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and hence $\arg \eta_1(z) = \arg z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, contradicting the hypothesis. Thus, there exists a set $E \subseteq C(\omega, a)$ of nonzero Lebesgue measure such that $\{\tilde{c} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)}) : c \in E\} \subseteq \text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$. Then, as η_2 extends analytically through $\text{Int}C(\tilde{\omega}, a)$, we have, by (4)

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1(c) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z_n^{(c)})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \eta_2\left(\frac{z_n^{(c)} \eta_1(\omega(z_n^{(c)}))}{\omega(z_n^{(c)})}\right) \\ &= \eta_2\left(\frac{a\eta_1(c)}{c}\right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $z \in E$. By analytic continuation, we conclude that

$$\eta_1(z) = \eta_2(a\eta_1(z)/z), \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

As we have already proved, this implies that u_1 and u_2 are conformal automorphisms of the upper half-plane, contradicting the hypothesis. This concludes the proof. $\square$

The results above will be used for analyzing properties of free multiplicative convolution. As in Section 1, we start by stating several well-known results.

In [32], Voiculescu introduces the S -transform, an analogue of the R -transform for free multiplicative convolution. We give below the main facts about the S -transform, and for proofs we refer to [32] and [10]. Let μ be a probability measure on $[0, +\infty)$, $\mu \neq \delta_0$. As observed in Remark 1.26, the restriction of η_μ to $(0, +\infty)$ is injective. Denote by $\eta_\mu^{-1}(z)$ its right inverse, defined on some neighbourhood of $\eta_\mu((-\infty, 0))$ in $\mathbb{C}^+$. Let $\Sigma_\mu(z) = \eta_\mu^{-1}(z)/z$.

THEOREM 1.30. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures supported on $[0, +\infty)$, none of them concentrated at zero. Then $\Sigma_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \Sigma_\mu(z)\Sigma_\nu(z)$ for all z in the common domain of the three functions.*

The function $S_\mu(z) = \Sigma_\mu\left(\frac{z}{1+z}\right)$ is called the S -transform of μ .

Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures on $[0, +\infty)$, none of them a point mass. Proposition 1.25 assures us that the functions $\eta_1 = \eta_\mu$ and $\eta_2 = \eta_\nu$ satisfy the conditions

of Corollary 1.28. With the notations from (4), let $\eta_3(z) = \eta_1(\omega(z)) = \eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))$. Observe that, by Corollary 1.28, η_3 satisfies the conditions of Proposition 1.25. By Remark 1.26 and Proposition 1.25, there exists an interval $(-s, 0)$ such that η_1, η_2 , and η_3 have right inverses on $(-s, 0)$. Let us replace z in the relation

$$z\eta_3(z) = \omega(z)\tilde{\omega}(z),$$

(equation (4)) by $\eta_3^{-1}(z)$. We obtain

$$z\eta_3^{-1} = \omega(\eta_3^{-1}(z))\tilde{\omega}(\eta_3^{-1}(z)) = \eta_1(z)\eta_2(z),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{z}\eta_3^{-1}(z) = \Sigma_\mu(z)\Sigma_\nu(z), \quad z \in (-s, 0).$$

By Theorem 1.30, we conclude that $\eta_3 = \eta_\mu \boxtimes \nu$.

We can give now a new proof to Biane's subordination result (see [13], Theorem 3.6):

COROLLARY 1.31. *Given two probability measures μ, ν on $[0, +\infty)$, there exists a pair of analytic functions $\omega_1, \omega_2: \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$ such that $\eta_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = \eta_\nu(\omega_2(z)) = \eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. If neither of μ, ν is concentrated at zero, the functions ω_1, ω_2 are unique and satisfy the following four properties*

- (a) $z\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \omega_1(z)\omega_2(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$.
- (b) $\omega_j(0-) = 0$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$,
- (c) $\arg \omega_j(z) \in [\arg z, \pi)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$,
- (d) $\omega_j(\bar{z}) = \overline{\omega_j(z)}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

PROOF. If one of the two measures, say μ , equals δ_0 , then $\mu \boxtimes \nu = \delta_0$, and $\omega_1(z) = 0$, $\omega_2(z) = 0$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$ will satisfy the required conditions. If one of the two measures, say μ , is concentrated at a point $a \in (0, +\infty)$, then the corollary is obviously true, with $\omega_1(z) = \eta_2(az)/a$ and $\omega_2(z) = az$. If none of the two measures is a point mass, then, as we have already seen, if we let $\eta_1 = \eta_\mu$ and $\eta_2 = \eta_\nu$, then the functions $\omega_1 = \omega$ and $\omega_2 = \tilde{\omega}$ provided by Corollary 1.28 will satisfy the requirements from the statement of the Corollary.

Property (a) has been proved before for the functions $\omega, \tilde{\omega}$ (see relation (4)). To prove property (b), observe that, by Proposition 1.25 and Remark 1.26, we have

$$\omega_1(0-) = \lim_{y \uparrow 0} \omega_1(y) = \lim_{y \uparrow 0} \eta_\mu^{-1}(\eta_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(y)) = \lim_{z \uparrow 0} \eta_\mu^{-1}(z) = 0.$$

Property (c) has been proved in Corollary 1.28, and property (d) follows trivially from the similar property of the functions η . $\square$

Next, we use the boundary properties of the subordination functions ω_1, ω_2 to describe the atomic and absolutely continuous parts with respect to the Lebesgue measure of the free convolution $\mu \boxplus \nu$ of two probability measures on the positive half-line, none of them a point mass. We start with some observations about the boundary behaviour of the function ψ_μ , particularly in the neighborhood of an atom. Fix a probability measure μ on $[0, +\infty)$ and a real number $a > 0$. The following two lemmas indicate how the presence or absence of an atom of μ can be detected from the boundary behaviour of ψ_μ .

LEMMA 1.32. *Suppose that $\{z_n = x_n + iy_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$ which converges tangentially to $[0, +\infty)$, i.e.*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_n}{x_n - t} = 0$$

for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n \psi_\mu(z_n) = 0$.

PROOF. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |y_n \psi_\mu(z_n)| &\leq y_n \int_{[0, +\infty)} \left| \frac{t(x_n + iy_n)}{1 - t(x_n + iy_n)} \right| d\mu(t) \\ &\leq \int_{[0, +\infty)} \frac{|y_n x_n|}{(y_n^2 + (\frac{1}{t} - x_n)^2)^{1/2}} d\mu(t) \\ &\quad + \int_{[0, +\infty)} \frac{y_n^2}{((\frac{1}{t} - x_n)^2 + y_n^2)^{1/2}} d\mu(t) \end{aligned}$$

The hypothesis implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_n x_n}{((\frac{1}{t} - x_n)^2 + y_n^2)^{1/2}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_n^2}{((\frac{1}{t} - x_n)^2 + y_n^2)^{1/2}} = 0$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Moreover

$$\left| y_n \frac{x_n + iy_n}{((\frac{1}{t} - x_n)^2 + y_n^2)^{1/2}} \right| = \left| y_n \frac{tz_n}{1 - tz_n} \right| \leq 2 \sup_n |z_n|,$$

and the desired result follows by dominated convergence. $\square$

LEMMA 1.33. *Suppose that $\{z_n = x_n + iy_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is a bounded sequence in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, $a \in (0, +\infty)$ and $z_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{a}$ nontangentially, i.e.*

$$\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{y_n}{x_n - (1/a)} \right| > 0.$$

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - az_n)\psi_\mu(z_n) = \mu(\{a\})$.

PROOF. Fix $m > \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \frac{x_n - (1/a)}{y_n} \right|$, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|(1 - z_n a)z_n t|^2}{|1 - z_n t|^2} &= a^2 \frac{((1/a) - x_n)^2 + y_n^2}{((1/t) - x_n)^2 + y_n^2} = \\ &= a^2 (x_n^2 + y_n^2) \frac{1 + \left(\frac{(1/a) - x_n}{y_n} \right)^2}{1 + \left(\frac{(1/t) - x_n}{y_n} \right)^2} < \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |z_n| (m^2 + 1) \end{aligned}$$

if $t \neq 0$. The inequality remains trivially true for $t = 0$ as well. Now $\frac{(1 - z_n a)z_n t}{1 - z_n t} \rightarrow 0$ if $t \neq \frac{1}{a}$, and $\frac{(1 - z_n a)z_n t}{1 - z_n t} \rightarrow 1$ if $t = 1/a$. The conclusion of the lemma follows then from the dominated convergence theorem. $\square$

REMARK 1.34. Relation $G_\mu(1/z) = z(\psi_\mu(z) + 1)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, implies that whenever $\psi_\mu|_{\mathbb{C}^+}$ extends analytically through a point $x \in (0, +\infty)$, G_μ will extend analytically through $1/x$, and hence the density of $\mu^{(ac)}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure will be analytic in the point $1/x$.

We take care first of a particular case, not covered by Theorem 1.29.

PROPOSITION 1.35. *Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures supported on the interval $[0, +\infty)$, none of them a point mass. Let $a \in (0, +\infty)$, and define $u_\mu(z) = a\eta_\mu(z)/z$, $u_\nu(z) = a\eta_\nu(z)/z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The function $u_\mu \circ u_\nu$ is a conformal automorphism of the upper half-plane if and only if μ and ν are convex combinations of two point masses. Moreover, in this case, $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc} = 0$, and the density of $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure is analytic everywhere, with the exception of at most four points.*

PROOF. Observe that u_μ and u_ν are nonconstant functions taking values in the upper half-plane. We claim that both u_μ and u_ν are conformal automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Indeed, let k be the inverse with respect to composition of $u_\mu \circ u_\nu$, so that

$$u_\mu(u_\nu(k(z))) = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

This implies that u_ν is injective. Applying u_ν to both sides of the above equality gives $u_\nu(u_\mu(w)) = w$ for all w in the open set $(u_\nu \circ k)(\mathbb{C}^+)$, so, by analytic continuation, for all $w \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This proves that u_ν must be surjective, and thus an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. Now it is obvious that u_μ must also be an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. This proves our claim.

As in the proof of Proposition 1.22, there exist real numbers $p, q, r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} p & q \\ s & r \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad u_\mu(z) = \frac{pz + q}{sz + r}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Since $zu_\mu(z) = a\eta_\mu(z) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we conclude that $s \neq 0$. Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that $s = 1$. Modulo a translation of μ and ν , we may assume that $a = 1$. By direct computation,

$$\eta_\mu(z) = zu_\mu(z) = \frac{pz^2 + qz}{z + r},$$

so that

$$\psi_\mu(z) = \frac{z(pz + q)}{-pz^2 - z(q - 1) + r}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Thus, μ is a convex combination of two atoms, at

$$\frac{q - 1 - \sqrt{(q - 1)^2 + 4pr}}{2r} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{q - 1 + \sqrt{(q - 1)^2 + 4pr}}{2r},$$

with weights

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{q + 1}{2r} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} - \frac{q + 1}{2r}.$$

A similar statement hold for ν .

Conversely, if $\nu = t\delta_u + (1 - t)\delta_v$, then a direct computation shows that

$$\psi_\nu(z) = z \frac{tu + (1 - t)v - zuv}{1 - z(u + v) + z^2uv},$$

so

$$\eta_\nu(z) = \frac{\psi_\nu(z)}{1 + \psi_\nu(z)} = z \frac{tu + (1-t)v - zuv}{1 - z((1-t)u + tv)},$$

and thus

$$u_\nu(z) = \frac{-zuv + tu + (1-t)v}{-z((1-t)u + tv) + 1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Observe that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} -uv & tu + (1-t)v \\ -(1-t)u - tv & 1 \end{bmatrix} = t(1-t)(u-v)^2 > 0.$$

This proves the first statement of the proposition.

Assume now that $\mu = s\delta_\alpha + (1-s)\delta_u$ and $\nu = t\delta_\beta + (1-t)\delta_v$. Modulo a translation, we may assume that $\alpha = \beta = 1$, $u, v > 0$. We shall compute the function η corresponding to the measure $(s\delta_1 + (1-s)\delta_u) \boxtimes (t\delta_1 + (1-t)\delta_v)$ by the same method as in the Proposition 1.22. Unfortunately, the expression of the function is much less manageable than in the additive case. As we have seen before,

$$\eta_\mu(z) = zu_\mu(z) = z \frac{(s + (1-s)u) - uz}{1 - z(su + (1-s))},$$

and

$$\eta_\nu(z) = zu_\nu(z) = z \frac{(t + (1-t)v) - vz}{1 - z(tv + (1-t))},$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. From equation (4), we conclude that the subordination function $\omega_1(z)$ must satisfy

$$\eta_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = \eta_\nu \left(\frac{z\eta_\mu(\omega_1(z))}{\omega_1(z)} \right),$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{\omega_1(z) (s + (1-s)u) - u\omega_1(z)^2}{1 - \omega_1(z) (su + 1-s)} = \frac{\left(\frac{z(\omega_1(z)(s+(1-s)u) - u\omega_1(z)^2)(t+(1-t)v)}{\omega_1(z)(1-\omega_1(z)(su+1-s))} - \frac{vz^2(\omega_1(z)(s+(1-s)u) - u\omega_1(z)^2)^2}{\omega_1(z)^2(1-\omega_1(z)(su+1-s))^2} \right)}{\left(1 - \frac{z(\omega_1(z)(s+(1-s)u) - u\omega_1(z)^2)(tv+1-t)}{\omega_1(z)(1-\omega_1(z)(su+1-s))} \right)}.$$

With the help of Maple, one can obtain the solution

$$\omega_1(z) = \frac{z^2 uv + z((v-u)(s+t-1) + (t-s)(vu-1)) - 1}{2(zu(1-t-tv) - (1-s+su))} - \frac{\sqrt{Az^4 + Bz^3 + Cz^2 + Dz + 1}}{2(zu(1-t-tv) - (1-s+su))},$$

where the coefficients A, B, C , and D are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= u^2 v^2, \\ B &= 2uv((v+u)((t-1)(s-1) - ts) + (1+uv)(t(s-1) + s(t-1))), \\ C &= (u^2 + v^2)(t+s-1)^2 \\ &\quad + 2(s(1-s) + t(1-t))(u+v-2uv+u^2v^2+uv^2) \\ &\quad + 4uv + (u^2v^2 + 1)(s-t)^2, \\ D &= -2((u+v) + (u-1)(v-1)(t(1-s) + s(1-t))). \end{aligned}$$

From the expression of ω_1 one can obtain ω_2 by simply interchanging (s, u) and (t, v) . By (4), $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \eta_\mu(\omega_1(z))$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$, so

$$\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \omega_1(z) \frac{(s + (1-s)u) - u\omega_1(z)}{1 - \omega_1(z)(su + 1 - s)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty).$$

Let us notice that, since $G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(1/z) = z(1 - \eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z))^{-1}$, the only points in $(0, +\infty)$ where the limit of $G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ is infinite are the points where the limit of $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ equals 1, and $G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ can be continued analytically to $x \in [0, +\infty)$ if and only if $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ can be continued meromorphically to $1/x$, and $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(1/x) \neq 1$. The only points where $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ may fail to extend meromorphically to $[0, +\infty)$ are the roots of the equation $Az^4 + Bz^3 + Cz^2 + Dz - 1 = 0$, while $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(1/x) = 1$ if and only if

$$\omega_1(1/x) \frac{(s + (1-s)u) - u\omega_1(1/x)}{1 - \omega_1(1/x)(su + 1 - s)} = 1/x,$$

i.e. if $\omega_1(1/x)$ satisfies an equation of degree two with coefficients in $\mathbb{R}$; the algebraic expression of ω_1 indicates clearly that there can be at most eight points x such that this happens. We conclude that there are at most twelve points in the interval $[0, +\infty)$ where $G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ may fail to continue analytically. We conclude that $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc} = 0$, and the density of $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$ is analytic everywhere, with at most twelve exceptions. This concludes the proof. $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main regularity result for free multiplicative convolutions of probability measures on the positive half-line (parts (1) and (2) of the theorem below appear also in [3]).

THEOREM 1.36. *Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures supported on the interval $[0, +\infty)$. Then:*

(1) *The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ *has an atom at* $a \in (0, +\infty)$;

(ii) *there exist* $u, v \in (0, +\infty)$ *so that* $uv = a$ *and* $\mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) > 1$. *Moreover,* $\mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) - 1 = (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\})$.

(2) $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) = \max\{\mu(\{0\}), \nu(\{0\})\}$.

(3) *Assume that neither* μ , *nor* ν *is a point mass. Then* $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$ *is always nonzero, and its density with respect to the Lebesgue measure is analytic outside a closed set of Lebesgue measure zero. The support of* $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc}$ *is closed, of zero Lebesgue measure, and included in the support of* $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$.

PROOF. We start by proving (1), (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). So let μ, ν satisfy condition (i). Set $z_n = \frac{1}{a} + i\frac{1}{n}$, $n \geq 1$, and note that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - az_n) \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) = (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) > 0,$$

by Lemma 1.33. This implies that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) = \infty$. We shall prove the existence of two numbers $u, v \in (0, +\infty)$ such that, after possibly dropping to a subsequence,

(j) $uv = a$;

(jj) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\mu(z_n) = 1/u$;

(jjj) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\nu(z_n) = 1/v$;

(jv) the sequence $\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)(\Re \omega_\mu(z_n) - (1/u))^{-1}$ does not converge to zero; and

(v) the sequence $\Im \omega_\nu(z_n)(\Re \omega_\nu(z_n) - (1/v))^{-1}$ does not converge to zero.

First, we claim that the sequence $\{\omega_\mu(z_n)\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is bounded. Assume to the contrary that there is a subsequence of $\omega_\mu(z_n)$ which tends to infinity. Observe that $\arg(\omega_\mu(z)) \geq \arg(z)$

by Corollary 1.31, so $\frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{\Re \omega_\mu(z_n)} \geq \frac{\Im(z_n)}{\Re(z_n)} = \frac{a}{n}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (1 - az_n) \frac{\omega_\mu(z_n)t}{1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)t} \right|^2 &= \left(\frac{a}{n} \right)^2 \frac{(\Re \omega_\mu(z_n))^2 + (\Im \omega_\mu(z_n))^2}{(\frac{1}{t} - \Re \omega_\mu(z_n))^2 + (\Im \omega_\mu(z_n))^2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{a}{n} \right)^2 \frac{1 + \left(\frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{\Re \omega_\mu(z_n)} \right)^2}{\left(\frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{\Re \omega_\mu(z_n)} \right)^2} = \left(\frac{a}{n} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{a \Re \omega_\mu(z_n)}{n \Im \omega_\mu(z_n)} \right)^2 \leq 1 + \left(\frac{a}{n} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the family of functions $\left\{ \mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \rightarrow i \frac{a}{n} \frac{\omega_\mu(z_n)t}{1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)t} \right\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is uniformly bounded and converges pointwise to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So we conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} i \frac{a}{n} \psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) = 0$.

But by Lemma 1.32, we obtain

$$0 < (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - az_n) \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[-i \frac{a}{n} \psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) \right].$$

This contradicts the previous equality, and therefore $\{\omega_\mu(z_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ must be bounded, as claimed. Passing to a subsequence, we infer the existence of $u \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\omega_\mu(z_n) \rightarrow \frac{1}{u}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Setting $v = a/u$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\nu(z_n) = \frac{1}{a \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\mu(z_n)} = \frac{1}{a/u} = \frac{1}{v}$$

by (5) and Lemma 1.33. Note that $u, v \in (0, +\infty)$; indeed, if $u \notin (0, +\infty)$, we would have $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) = \psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) \rightarrow \psi_\mu(u)$, which is a finite number. This proves (j), (jj) and (jjj).

To prove (jv), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\Im \omega_\mu(z_n) \psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n))| &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{(-ia/n)} (1 - az_n) \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) \right| \\ &= (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{(-ia/n)} \right| \geq (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\Re \omega_\mu(z_n)| \\ &= (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) u > 0, \end{aligned}$$

by Corollary 1.31 and Lemma 1.33. Also, the sequence

$$\left\{ \left| \frac{\Im \omega_\mu(z_n)}{\Re \omega_\mu(z_n) - (1/u)} \right| \right\}_{n=0}^\infty$$

does not converge to zero, by Lemma 1.32. Dropping if necessary to a subsequence, we can assume that it is bounded away from zero. This proves (jv). Statement (v) follows by symmetry.

Conditions (jj) and (jv) allow us to apply Lemma 1.33 to conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)u)\psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) = \mu(\{u\})$$

and analogously

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - \omega_\nu(z_n)v)\psi_\nu(\omega_\nu(z_n)) = \nu(\{v\}).$$

We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) = \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)u)\psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) + (1 - \omega_\nu(z_n)v)\psi_\nu(\omega_\nu(z_n))] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)u)\psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) + \omega_\mu(z_n)u(1 - \omega_\nu(z_n)v)\psi_\nu(\omega_\nu(z_n))] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - \omega_\mu(z_n)\omega_\nu(z_n)uv)\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n)] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - az_n)\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) + a(z_n - \omega_\mu(z_n)\omega_\nu(z_n))\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n)] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [(1 - az_n)\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n)] + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [a\omega_\mu(z_n)\omega_\nu(z_n)] \\ &= (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}) + a\bar{a} = 1 + (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\}), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (5) in the next to the last equality. This completes the proof of (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii).

To prove (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i), consider two free selfadjoint random variables X and Y in the tracial noncommutative probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ having distributions μ and ν respectively. The fact that μ has an atom at u , ν has an atom at v and $\mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) > 1$ is equivalent to the fact that there are projections p and q with $\tau(p) + \tau(q) > 1$ such that $Xp = up$ and $Yq = vq$. Then $p \wedge q \neq 0$ and $X^{1/2}YX^{1/2}(p \wedge q) = uv(p \wedge q)$, so $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ has an atom at uv . This concludes the proof of part (1).

To prove (2), let X and Y be two selfadjoint random variables as in the proof of (a). Note that for any projection p such that $Xp = 0$, we also have that $X^{1/2}YX^{1/2}p = 0$, and we deduce that $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) \geq \mu(\{0\})$. Since $\boxtimes$ is commutative, we have $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) \geq \max\{\mu(\{0\}), \nu(\{0\})\}$.

We first prove the opposite inequality for $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) < 1$. To do this, we analyze the behaviour of $\psi_\mu(z)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$ nontangentially to $[0, +\infty)$. Consider the truncated cone $\Gamma = \{x + iy : y > 0, x \leq y, |x| + |y| \geq 1\}$ and note that for $z = x + iy \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\left| \frac{zt}{1-zt} \right|^2 = \left| \frac{(x+iy)t}{1-(x+iy)t} \right|^2 < 3, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Since $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma} \frac{zt}{1-zt}$ equals -1 if $t \neq 0$ and 0 if $t = 0$, the dominated convergence theorem yields $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma} \psi_\mu(z) = \mu(\{0\}) - 1$. Applying this fact to $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ combined with (5), we obtain

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty, z \in \Gamma} \frac{\omega_\mu(z)\omega_\nu(z)}{\omega_\mu(z)\omega_\nu(z) - z} = 1 - (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}).$$

We deduce that $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \omega_\mu(z)\omega_\nu(z) = \infty$ and therefore there is a sequence $z_n \in \Gamma$ such that $z_n \rightarrow \infty$ and either $\omega_\mu(z_n) \rightarrow \infty$, or $\omega_\nu(z_n) \rightarrow \infty$. Assume for simplicity that $\omega_\mu(z_n) \rightarrow \infty$, and note that $\omega_\mu(z_n) \in \Gamma$ by Corollary 1.31. By the preceding calculations, we must have

$$(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) - 1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\mu(\omega_\mu(z_n)) = \mu(\{0\}) - 1.$$

Thus $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) \leq \max\{\mu(\{0\}), \nu(\{0\})\}$ whenever $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) < 1$. To conclude the proof, we must show that $\mu(\{0\}) < 1$ and $\nu(\{0\}) < 1$ implies $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{0\}) < 1$. Indeed, in this case Corollary 1.31 applies to show that $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu} = \psi_\mu \circ \omega_\mu$ is not identically zero.

The proof of (3) is similar to the proof of part (2) of Theorem 1.23. Suppose that $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac} = 0$. Part (1) of the theorem shows that $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ cannot be purely atomic, and thus, $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc} \neq 0$. Since $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu} = (1/z)G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(1/z) - 1$, we conclude as in the proof of part (2) of Theorem 1.23 that $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \Im \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(x + iy) = 0$ for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and that there exists a point $x_0 \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ does not continue analytically through x_0 . Theorem 1.10 can now be applied to the function $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ and the point x_0 to conclude that $C(\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}, x_0) = \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$, and hence $C(\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}, x_0) = \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$. Relation (4) implies that $C(\omega_j, x_0) \cap \mathbb{C}^+$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ are also infinite sets (we recall that ω_1, ω_2 are the subordination functions provided by Corollary 1.31). Applying Theorem 1.29 and Proposition 1.35 yields a contradiction. Thus, $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ cannot be purely singular.

Next we show that there exists a closed subset of $[0, +\infty)$ of zero Lebesgue measure on whose complement the density $f(x) = \frac{d(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}}{dx}$ is analytic. By Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 1.24, there exists a set $E \subset [0, +\infty)$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus E$ the limits $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(x + iy)$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_j(x + iy)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ exist and are finite. Also, for almost all $x \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $(1/x) \in \text{supp}((\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}) \setminus E$, with respect to $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$, we

have $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu} \left(\frac{1}{x+iy} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, so that

$$\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(x+iy) = \left(\frac{1}{x} \lim_{y \downarrow 0} G_{\mu \boxtimes \nu} \left(\frac{1}{x+iy} \right) - 1 \right) \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

By equation (5), at least one of $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_j(x+iy)$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ must also be in $\mathbb{C}^+$. For definiteness, assume that $\omega_1(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} \omega_1(x+iy) \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Part (1) of Theorem 1.29 and Proposition 1.35 assure us that ω_1 extends analytically through x . Since $\omega_1(x) \in \mathbb{C}^+$, the function $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu} = \psi_\mu \circ \omega_1$ will also extend analytically through x . By Remark 1.34, we conclude that the density of $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure must be analytic in $1/x$. The set A of points $x \in \text{supp}((\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac})$ where $f(x) = \frac{d(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}(x)}{dx}$ is analytic is open in $\mathbb{R}$, and its complement in $\text{supp}((\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac})$ is of zero Lebesgue measure. On the other hand, if there exists an interval $J \subseteq [0, +\infty) \setminus \text{supp}((\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac})$, then $\lim_{y \downarrow 0} \Im \psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(x+iy) = 0$ for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $1/x \in J$, and the argument used in the proof of the existence of the absolutely continuous part of $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ shows that $\psi_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}$ extends meromorphically through $\{x: 1/x \in J\}$. In particular, $J \cap \text{supp}((\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc}) = \emptyset$. $\square$

3. Regularity for the free multiplicative convolution of probability measures on the unit circle

The tools and methods from this section are very similar to the ones used in the previous section. Let μ be a Borel probability measure on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$, and define the moment generating function

$$\psi_\sigma(z) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{zt}{1-zt} d\sigma(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

(Recall that $\mathbb{D}$ denotes the unit disk.) Observe that

$$\psi_\mu(z) = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu(e^{-it}) = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu(e^{-it}), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

This immediately yields the following result.

PROPOSITION 1.37. *Let $\psi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\psi = \psi_\mu$.*
- (2) *$\psi(0) = 0$ and $\Re \psi(z) \geq -1/2$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*

The corresponding result for the function $\eta_\mu = \psi_\mu/(1 + \psi_\mu)$ is as follows.

PROPOSITION 1.38. *Let $\eta : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\eta = \eta_\mu$.*
- (2) *$\eta(0) = 0$ and $|\eta(z)| < 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*
- (3) *$|\eta(z)| \leq |z|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*

Moreover, μ is a point mass if and only if there exists $z_0 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\eta_\mu(z_0)| = |z_0|$.

PROOF. The equivalence of (2) and (3) is, of course, the Schwarz lemma, while the equivalence between (1) and (2) is a trivial consequence of Proposition 1.37. Suppose now that there exists $z_0 \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $|\eta_\mu(z_0)| = |z_0|$. Then $\eta_\mu(z_0) = e^{i\theta} z_0$ for some $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. The function $g(z) = \eta_\mu(z)/z$ maps $\mathbb{D}$ into $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, so, since $|g(z_0)| = 1$, by the maximum principle we conclude that g must be constant, and thus $\eta_\mu(z) = e^{i\theta} z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus, $\psi_\mu(z) = ze^{i\theta}(1 - ze^{i\theta})^{-1}$, so that $\mu = \delta_{e^{i\theta}}$. The converse is trivial. $\square$

Next we prove the analogue of Theorem 1.27 for self-maps of the unit disk which fix the origin.

THEOREM 1.39. *Let $\eta_j : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, be two analytic functions, none of them a conformal automorphism of the unit disk, satisfying $\eta_j(0) = 0$, $\eta'_j(0) \neq 0$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Define $f : (\mathbb{D} \cup \mathbb{T}) \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ by*

$$f(z, w) = \frac{w\eta_2\left(z\frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}\right)}{\eta_1(w)},$$

where we understand $\frac{\eta(0)}{0}$ as $\eta'(0)$. Then

- (1) *The function f is analytic on $\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$ and takes values in $\mathbb{D}$.*
- (2) *There exists a unique analytic function $\omega : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that*

$$f(z, \omega(z)) = \omega(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Moreover, $\omega(0) = 0$.

PROOF. It is obvious that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, w \rightarrow 0} f(z, w) = \frac{\eta_2(z_0 \eta_1'(0))}{\eta_1'(0)},$$

for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{D}$. The only problem that might occur is when there exists a $w_0 \neq 0$ such that $\eta_1(w_0) = 0$. But then

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, w \rightarrow w_0} f(z, w) = \lim_{z \rightarrow z_0, w \rightarrow w_0} z \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}\right)}{z \frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}} = z_0 \eta_2'(0).$$

So f is a well-defined complex-valued analytic function. To see that it takes values in the unit disc, we apply the Schwarz lemma to conclude that for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$, $w \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\eta_1(w) \neq 0$ we have

$$|f(z, w)| = \left| \frac{\eta_2\left(z \frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}\right)}{\frac{\eta_1(w)}{w}} \right| \leq \left| z \frac{\eta_1(w)}{w} \right| = |z| < 1.$$

This inequality extends by continuity to all points $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$. This proves (1).

We now prove (2). Fix a point $z \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.16, the function $f_z(w) = f(z, w)$ is a self-map of the unit disc, satisfying, as shown above, the inequality $|f_z(w)| \leq |z| < 1$. Thus, according to Theorem 1.14, it must have a (unique) Denjoy-Wolff point. Denote it by $\omega(z)$. Since (by the same Theorem 1.14), we have $|f'_z(\omega(z))| < 1$, we can apply the Implicit Function Theorem to conclude that the dependence $z \mapsto \omega(z)$ is analytic. Obviously, $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \omega(z) = 1$. This proves (2) and concludes the proof. $\square$

As before, we observe that there exists an analytic function $\tilde{\omega}: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$, $\tilde{\omega}(z) = z\eta_1(\omega(z))/\omega(z)$, such that

$$\tilde{\omega}(z) = \frac{\tilde{\omega}(z) \eta_1\left(z \frac{\eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))}{\tilde{\omega}(z)}\right)}{\eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z))}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

The pair of functions $(\omega, \tilde{\omega})$ is uniquely determined by the equations

$$(6) \quad \eta_1(\omega(z)) = \eta_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) = \frac{1}{z} \omega(z) \tilde{\omega}(z)$$

As in Section 2, equation (6) can be expressed in terms of the functions $\psi = \eta/(1 - \eta)$:

$$(7) \quad \psi_1(\omega(z)) = \psi_2(\tilde{\omega}(z)) = \frac{\omega(z) \tilde{\omega}(z)}{z - \omega(z) \tilde{\omega}(z)}$$

REMARK 1.40. It is obvious that the condition $\eta'_j(0) \neq 0$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$ cannot be removed, since in that case we would (by Theorem 1.14) have $\omega(z) = \tilde{\omega}(z) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. However, one can still consider the case when only one of the two functions η , say η_1 , has its derivative at the origin equal to zero. Indeed, in this case the proof of Theorem 1.39 applies to provide a function ω with the property that $\omega(z)$ is the fixed point of f_z . In this case we can still define $\tilde{\omega}$ by $\tilde{\omega}(z) = z\eta_1(\omega(z))/\omega(z)$, but $\tilde{\omega}(z)$ will not be necessarily the fixed point of $g_z = g(z, \cdot)$, where

$$g(z, w) = \frac{w\eta_1\left(z\frac{\eta_2(w)}{w}\right)}{\eta_2(w)};$$

in fact, if there exists a point $w_0 \neq 0$ in the unit disk such that $\eta_2(w_0) = 0$, then $g_z(0) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

In the following theorem we describe some boundary properties of the functions ω and $\tilde{\omega}$. Since the proof is similar to the proofs of Theorems 1.17 and 1.29, we omit it.

THEOREM 1.41. *Let η_1, η_2, f and ω be as in Theorem 1.39. Fix a point $a \in \mathbb{T}$ and define the following two self-maps of the upper half-plane: $u_j(z) = a\eta_j(z)/z$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Assume that $u_2 \circ u_1$ is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$. Then:*

- (1) *If $C(\omega, a) \cap \mathbb{D} \neq \emptyset$, then the function ω extends analytically in a neighbourhood of a .*
- (2) *Assume that there exist open intervals I_1, I_2 such that η_j continues analytically through $\{e^{i\theta} : \theta \in I_j\}$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Then the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow a} \omega(z)$ exists in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$.*

We shall apply the previous results to the study of free convolutions of probability measures on the unit circle (for details, see [32]). The definition and properties of the S -transform for measures on $\mathbb{T}$ are similar to the ones from Section 2. However, in order to invert the function η_μ around zero one needs the condition $\eta'_\mu(0) \neq 0$. This is equivalent to $\int_0^{2\pi} e^{it} d\mu(e^{it}) \neq 0$ because

$$\eta'_\mu(0) = \psi'_\mu(0) = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{it} d\mu(e^{it}).$$

Under this condition, the inverse η_μ^{-1} is defined in a neighborhood of zero, and so is $\Sigma_\mu(z) = \eta_\mu^{-1}(z)/z$. The identity

$$\Sigma_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \Sigma_\mu(z) \Sigma_\nu(z)$$

holds in a neighborhood of zero provided that $\eta'_\mu(0) \neq 0 \neq \eta'_\nu(0)$. We can now prove a subordination theorem for free multiplicative convolution on the unit circle (see [13], Theorem 3.5).

COROLLARY 1.42. *Given two Borel probability measures μ, ν on the unit circle, there exists a pair of analytic functions $\omega_1, \omega_2: \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $\eta_\mu(\omega_1(z)) = \eta_\nu(\omega_2(z)) = \eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. The pair of functions ω_1, ω_2 is uniquely determined by the following properties:*

- (a) $z \eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \omega_1(z) \omega_2(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$;
- (b) $\omega_j(0) = 0$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$;
- (c) $|\omega_j(z)| \leq |z|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

PROOF. If both μ and ν have first moment equal to zero, then we conclude by Definitions 0.2 and 0.5 that $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ has all moments equal to zero, so $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ is the uniform distribution (the Haar measure) on $\mathbb{T}$. We conclude that $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, so the functions $\omega_1(z) = \omega_2(z) = 0$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$ will do. If only one of the two measures has first moment zero, then, choosing in Remark 1.40, $\omega_1 = \omega$ and $\omega_2 = \tilde{\omega}$ will provide the required pair. Observe that in this case the function ω_1 is uniquely determined. If both μ and ν have nonzero first moment, then choosing $\omega_1 = \omega$ in Theorem 1.39 and $\omega_2 = \tilde{\omega}$ from equation (6) will do. The uniqueness is guaranteed by Theorem 1.39, and the properties (a) through (c) are elementary consequences of Theorem 1.39. $\square$

For measures on $\mathbb{T}$ we shall consider absolute continuity with respect to the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$. The notations will be the same as in Section 1. The following regularity result holds for free convolutions of probability measures supported on $\mathbb{T}$. The proof (see also [3]) is similar to the proofs of Theorems 1.23 and 1.36 and will be omitted.

THEOREM 1.43. *Let μ, ν be two Borel probability measures supported on $\mathbb{T}$. Then:*

(1) *The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\mu \boxtimes \nu$ has an atom at $a \in (0, +\infty)$;

(ii) *there exist $u, v \in (0, +\infty)$ so that $uv = a$ and $\mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) > 1$. Moreover, $\mu(\{u\}) + \nu(\{v\}) - 1 = (\mu \boxtimes \nu)(\{a\})$.*

(2) *Assume that neither μ , nor ν is a point mass. Then $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$ is always nonzero, and its density with respect to the Lebesgue measure is analytic outside a closed set of Lebesgue measure zero. The support of $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{sc}$ is closed, of zero Lebesgue measure, and included in the support of $(\mu \boxtimes \nu)^{ac}$.*

CHAPTER 2

Semigroups relative to free convolutions

In this chapter we study from an analytic point of view the existence and some properties of partially defined free convolution semigroups. The existence of these objects, which have no classical counterpart, has been first observed in [11]: it is shown there that for any given compactly supported probability measure μ on the real line, there exists a number $T \geq 1$ and a family of compactly supported probability measures $\{\mu_t : t \geq T\}$ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu_{t+s} = \mu_t \boxplus \mu_s$ for all $s, t \geq T$ and $\mu_t = \underbrace{\mu \boxplus \cdots \boxplus \mu}_{t \text{ times}}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \geq T$. Using combinatorial tools, Nica and Speicher have proved in [26] that all the above statements are true for $T = 1$.

An analytic approach to the existence of the family $\{\mu_t : t \geq T\}$ can be found in [4]. As a consequence of results in Chapter 1 we know that for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an analytic self-map ω_t of $\mathbb{C}^+$ such that $G_{\mu_t} = G_\mu \circ \omega_t$. In [4] it is shown that this result extends to noninteger values of $t > 1$. The proof of the existence of the subordination function turns out to provide a sufficient argument for the existence of the measures μ_t for all $t > 1$. Several regularity results are deduced from properties of the function ω_t .

The approach presented in this chapter is based on Theorem 1.14. We show existence and regularity properties for measures in partial semigroups with respect to both additive and multiplicative convolutions. We also investigate connections with infinite divisibility with respect to free and boolean convolutions, and point out some new properties of the Cauchy transforms of measures which are infinitely divisible with respect to free convolutions. Most of the results presented here appear in [5].

1. Partial semigroups with respect to free additive convolution

We present first a global inversion theorem for certain analytic functions defined in the upper half-plane. A somewhat weaker result has been proved in [4], Theorem 2.2.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let $H : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function such that $\Im H(z) \leq \Im z$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and the limit*

$$a = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{H(iy)}{iy}$$

is strictly positive.

- (1) *For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+$ there exists a unique $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $H(z) = \alpha$.*
- (2) *There exists a continuous function $\omega : \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$ such that $\omega(\mathbb{C}^+) \subset \mathbb{C}^+$, $\omega|_{\mathbb{C}^+}^+$ is analytic, and $H(\omega(z)) = z$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.*
- (3) *For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$, $\omega(\alpha)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of the map $g_\alpha : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$g_\alpha(z) = z + \alpha - H(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

- (4) *The function ω satisfies $\Re \omega'(z) > 1/2$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and*

$$|\omega(z_1) - \omega(z_2)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|z_1 - z_2|, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}.$$

In particular, ω is one-to-one.

- (5) *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\Im \omega(\alpha) > 0$, then ω can be continued analytically to a neighborhood of α .*

PROOF. Let us first consider the function $\varphi(z) = z - H(z)$ which maps $\mathbb{C}^+$ to its closure, and therefore can be written in Nevanlinna integral form

$$\varphi(z) = c + bz + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1+zt}{t-z} d\sigma(t), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

with $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \geq 0$, and σ a Borel, finite, positive measure on the real line. Since clearly

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\varphi(iy)}{iy} = b,$$

and $\Im \varphi(z) \geq b \Im z$, we easily deduce that $a = 1 - b$ and $a \in (0, 1]$.

In order to prove (1), fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We shall argue that the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α belongs to $\mathbb{C}^+$. First,

$$\Im g_\alpha(z) = \Im z + \Im \alpha - \Im H(z) \geq \Im \alpha > 0,$$

so that the Denjoy-Wolff point cannot be a real number. On the other hand it cannot be infinity either because

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{iy}{iy + \alpha - H(iy)} = \frac{1}{1-a} > 1,$$

where the last fraction must be understood as $+\infty$ if $a = 1$. Denote then by $z_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+$ the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α , and note that it is then the unique fixed point of g_α . Fixed points z for g_α are precisely points with $H(z) = \alpha$, and the function $\omega(\alpha) = z_\alpha$ is analytic, by the implicit function theorem. This proves (1), and the part of (2) and (3) pertaining to points $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+$.

Let us note at this point that g_α is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$, and therefore $|g'_\alpha(z_\alpha)| < 1$. Equivalently,

$$\left| 1 - \frac{1}{\omega'(\alpha)} \right| = |1 - H'(\omega(\alpha))| = |1 - H'(z_\alpha)| < 1,$$

so that $\Re \omega'(\alpha) > 1/2$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^+$. This implies the inequality

$$|\omega(z_1) - \omega(z_2)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|z_1 - z_2|, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

We shall show now that ω extends by continuity to a function $:\overline{\mathbb{C}^+} \cup \{\infty\} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{C}^+} \cup \{\infty\}$, and thus the preceding inequality will persist for $z_1, z_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ (the proof appears also in [4], Proposition 2.4). First assume that there exists a sequence $z_n \rightarrow x$ such that the limit $\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$ exists and belongs to $\mathbb{C}^+$. In this case we have $H(\lambda) = x$. Denote by $n \geq 1$ the order of the zero of $H(z) - x$ at $z = \lambda$. We can find analytic functions $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_n$ defined in a set of the form $\Omega = \{w : 0 < |w - x| < \delta, w \notin x - i\mathbb{R}_+\}$ such that $H(\omega_j(w)) = w$ for $w \in \Omega$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Clearly ω must coincide with one of the functions ω_j on $\Omega \cap \mathbb{C}^+$ and it follows that ω extends continuously to the interval $(x - \delta, x + \delta)$.

Assume to the contrary that there is no sequence z_n as in the first part of the argument. In other words, if $z_n \rightarrow x$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$ exists, this limit is either infinite or real. Assume now that two sequences $z_n, w_n \in \mathbb{C}^+$ have limit equal to x and the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n),$

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(w_n)$ exist and are different. Consider a continuous path $\gamma : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ passing through all the points z_n and w_n , and such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = x$. There exists then an open interval $(\alpha, \beta) \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $s \in (\alpha, \beta)$ there is a sequence $t_n \rightarrow 1$ such that $\omega(\gamma(t_n)) \rightarrow s$. In fact t_n can be chosen so that $\omega(\gamma(t_n)) \rightarrow s$ nontangentially as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $H(\omega(\gamma(t_n))) = \gamma(t_n)$, we deduce that the nontangential limit $H(s)$ of H at s is equal to x almost everywhere. Theorem 1.7 shows now that H must be constant, and this is a contradiction. Therefore $\lim_{z \rightarrow x} \omega(z)$ exists. The case $x = \infty$ is treated similarly.

To conclude the proof of (2) we still need to show that $\omega(x)$ is finite if $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This will follow once we establish (3) for points on the boundary.

We proceed by proving that (3) and (5) hold for a point $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with the property that $\omega(\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Fix such a point α , and set $w = \omega(\alpha)$. With the trivial exception of $H(z) = z + c, c \in \mathbb{R}$, the function g_α still maps $\mathbb{C}^+$ to $\mathbb{C}^+$, and $g_\alpha(w) = w$. Indeed,

$$H(w) = H(\omega(\alpha)) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} H(\omega(\alpha + iy)) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} (\alpha + iy) = \alpha.$$

Thus w is indeed the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α . We conclude that $|g'_\alpha(w)| \leq 1$, with equality only when g_α is a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$. The last case is trivial. Indeed, when $a < 1$, we have $g_\alpha(\infty) = \infty$, so that g_α can only be an automorphism of the form $g_\alpha(z) = (1 - a)z + b$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}$. In this case $H(z) = az + \alpha - b$, and the conclusions of the theorem are obvious since

$$\omega(z) = \frac{1}{a}(z - \alpha + b).$$

If $a = 1$ and g_α is an automorphism, we must have

$$g_\alpha(z) = b - \frac{c}{d - z}$$

for some real numbers b, c, d with $c > 0$. In this case

$$H(z) = z + \alpha - b + \frac{c}{z - d}, \quad H'(z) = 1 - \frac{c}{(z - d)^2},$$

and the zeros of H' are $d \pm \sqrt{c} \in \mathbb{R}$. We conclude that $H'(w) \neq 0$. The same conclusion holds when g_α is not an automorphism because

$$|1 - H'(w)| = |g'_\alpha(w)| < 1.$$

In both cases, the local inverse of H at w will be an analytic continuation of ω in a neighborhood of α .

To conclude, we must complete the proof of (3) by showing that $\omega(\alpha)$ cannot be infinite if $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and that $\omega(\alpha)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α . Fix then $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, and exclude the case $\omega(\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}^+$ which has just been treated. We can also assume that the map g_α is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{C}^+$, since in this case the function ω can be calculated explicitly. As in the first part of the proof,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{iy}{g_\alpha(iy)} = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \frac{iy}{iy + \alpha - H(iy)} = \frac{1}{1-a} > 1,$$

which shows that ∞ is not the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α . We conclude then that this Denjoy-Wolff point z_α is a real number. We will show that $\omega(\alpha) = z_\alpha$. To do this we observe that (since the Julia-Carathéodory derivative of g_α at z_α is no more than one) g_α maps the horodisk $D_y = \{z : |z - (z_\alpha + iy/2)| < y/2\}$ into itself for $y > 0$. In particular, since g_α has no fixed points in $\mathbb{C}^+$,

$$\Im g_\alpha(z_\alpha + iy) < y, \quad y > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\Im H(z_\alpha + iy) = \Im(z_\alpha + iy + \alpha - g_\alpha(z_\alpha + iy)) = y - \Im g_\alpha(z_\alpha + iy) > 0.$$

We also have

$$\lim_{y \downarrow 0} H(z_\alpha + iy) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} (z_\alpha + iy + \alpha - g_\alpha(z_\alpha + iy)) = \alpha,$$

so that, at long last,

$$\omega(\alpha) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \omega(H(z_\alpha + iy)) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} (z_\alpha + iy) = z_\alpha,$$

as claimed. □

Let now μ be a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. We shall use Theorem 2.1 to prove the existence of a family $\{\mu_t : t \geq 1\}$ such that $\mu_1 = \mu$ and $\mu_{t+s} = \mu_t \boxplus \mu_s$. We recall that, by Theorem 1.19, it will be enough to show that for each $t > 1$ there exists a probability measure μ_t on the real line such that $\varphi_{\mu_t}(z) = t\varphi_\mu(z)$ for z in the common domain of the two functions. A slightly weaker version of this result can be found in [4].

THEOREM 2.2. *Consider a Borel probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$, and a real number $t \geq 1$.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure μ_t satisfying $\varphi_{\mu_t}(z) = t\varphi_\mu(z)$ for z in the common domain of the two functions.*
- (2) *There exists an injective analytic map $\omega_t : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $F_{\mu_t}(z) = F_\mu(\omega_t(z))$, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.*
- (3) *We have $\omega_t(z) = \frac{1}{t}z + (1 - \frac{1}{t})F_\mu(z)$, and $H_t(\omega_t(z)) = z$, where $H_t(z) = tz + (1 - t)F_\mu(z)$, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$.*

PROOF. If $t = 1$, clearly $\mu_1 = \mu$ and $\omega_1(z) = z$ will satisfy the conclusions of the theorem. Assume therefore that $t > 1$. We clearly have

$$\begin{aligned} \Im H_t(z) &= t\Im z - (t-1)\Im F_\mu(z) \\ &\leq t\Im z - (t-1)\Im z \\ &= \Im z, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{H_t(iy)}{iy} = t - (t-1) \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F_\mu(iy)}{iy} = 1.$$

Therefore, Theorem 2.1 implies the existence of an analytic function $\omega_t : \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ satisfying $H_t(\omega_t(z)) = z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We also have $\Im \omega_t(z) \geq \Im z$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega_t(iy)/iy = 1$. It follows that the function

$$F_t(z) = \frac{t\omega_t(z) - z}{t-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+$$

satisfies the conditions $\Im F_t(z) \geq \Im z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} F_t(iy)/(iy) = 1$. By Proposition 1.2, these conditions imply the existence of a Borel probability measure μ_t on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying $F_{\mu_t} = F_t$. Note that the definition of F_t yields the first formula in (3). To prove (2) we observe that

$$F_\mu(z) = \frac{tz - H_t(z)}{t-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+,$$

so that

$$F_\mu(\omega_t(z)) = \frac{t\omega_t(z) - z}{t-1} = F_t(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Finally, let us observe that, for z in the domain of definition of φ_{μ_t} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
z &= F_{\mu_t}(z + \varphi_{\mu_t}(z)) \\
&= F_{\mu}(\omega_t(z + \varphi_{\mu_t}(z))) \\
&= F_{\mu}\left(\frac{1}{t}[z + \varphi_{\mu_t}(z)] + \left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right)F_{\mu_t}(z + \varphi_{\mu_t}(z))\right) \\
&= F_{\mu}\left(\frac{1}{t}[z + \varphi_{\mu_t}(z)] + \left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right)\frac{1}{z}\right) \\
&= F_{\mu}\left(z + \frac{1}{t}\varphi_{\mu_t}(z)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (2) in the second equality, and (3) in the third equality. We conclude that the function $\rho(z) = \frac{1}{t}\varphi_{\mu_t}(z)$ satisfies $\lim_{y \rightarrow 0} y\rho(iy) = 0$ and $F_{\mu}(z + \rho(z)) = z$. Therefore, $\rho(z) = \varphi_{\mu}(z)$, which proves (1). $\square$

Due to their properties, it is natural to denote the probability measures μ_t from the theorem above by $\mu^{\boxplus t}$. In the following, we describe regularity properties of probability measures $\mu^{\boxplus t}$ for $t > 1$. We shall use Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 to describe the boundary behavior of $F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}$ and thus characterize the absolutely continuous, singular continuous, and atomic, parts of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$. We recall that $-\frac{1}{\pi}\Im G_{\mu}(x + iy)$ is the Poisson integral of the measure μ , and hence μ can be recovered as the weak*-limit of the measures

$$d\nu_y(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\Im G_{\mu}(x + iy) dx$$

as $y \downarrow 0$. In particular, the density of μ (relative to Lebesgue measure) is the dx -a.e. limit of $(-1/\pi)\Im G_{\mu}(x + iy)$ as $y \downarrow 0$, and this limit is, as seen also in Lemma 1.21, a.e. infinite relative to the singular part of the measure μ . More specifically, x is an atom of μ if and only if $F_{\mu}(x) = 0$ and the Julia-Carathéodory derivative $F'_{\mu}(x)$ is finite. The value of this derivative is then

$$F'_{\mu}(x) = \frac{1}{\mu(\{x\})}.$$

These observations can now be used to prove a somewhat stronger version of the regularity results proved in [4].

THEOREM 2.3. *Let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$, and let $t > 1$.*

- (1) A point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = 0$ if and only if x/t is an atom of μ with mass $\mu(\{x/t\}) \geq (t-1)/t$. If $\mu(\{x/t\}) > (t-1)/t$, then x is an atom of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$, and

$$\mu^{\boxplus t}(\{x\}) = t\mu\left(\left\{\frac{x}{t}\right\}\right) - (t-1).$$

- (2) The nonatomic part of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$ is absolutely continuous, and its density is continuous except at the (finitely many) points x such that $F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = 0$.
- (3) The density of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$ is analytic at all points where it is different from zero.

PROOF. Assume first that $F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = 0$. This is equivalent to $\omega_t(x) = x/t$, or, equivalently, x/t is the Denjoy-Wolff point of the function $g_x(z) = z - x + H_t(z)$ defined in Theorem 2.1 (3). By Theorem 1.14, and the definition of g_x , this is equivalent to $H_t(x/t) = x$ and $H'_t(x/t) \geq 0$. We have then

$$x = H_t\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) = t\frac{x}{t} - (t-1)F_\mu\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) = x - (t-1)F_\mu\left(\frac{x}{t}\right),$$

so that $F_\mu(x/t) = 0$. Moreover, $H'_t(z) = t - (t-1)F'_\mu(z)$, so that

$$t - (t-1)F'_\mu\left(\frac{x}{t}\right) \geq 0.$$

This yields $F'_\mu(x/t) \leq t/(t-1)$, indicating that x/t is an atom of μ with the required mass. Conversely, if $\mu(\{x/t\}) \geq (t-1)/t$, then the calculations above show that $H_t(x/t) = x$ and $H'_t(x/t) \geq 0$. Thus, $g_x(x/t) = x/t$ and $g'(x/t) \leq 1$. We conclude by Theorem 1.14 that x/t is the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_x . Thus, $x/t \in \omega_t(\mathbb{R})$, and $\omega_t(x) = x/t$. Therefore

$$F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = \frac{t\omega_t(x) - x}{t-1} = 0.$$

In case $\mu(\{x/t\}) > (t-1)/t$, we have $H'_t(x/t) = t - (t-1)F'_\mu(x/t) > 0$. This implies that $g'_x(x/t) < 1$ and therefore

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\triangleleft]{x/t} x/t} \frac{H_t(z) - x}{z - x/t}$$

exists and belongs to $(0, 1)$. We conclude that H_t maps any nontangential path γ in $\mathbb{C}^+$ ending at x/t into a nontangential path $H_t(\gamma)$ ending at x , and having the part sufficiently close to x included in $\mathbb{C}^+$. Thus, $\omega'_t(x) = 1/H'_t(x/t)$. We deduce that

$$F'_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = \frac{t\omega'_t(x) - 1}{t-1} = \frac{t\frac{\mu(\{x/t\})}{t\mu(\{x/t\}) - (t-1)} - 1}{t-1} = \frac{1}{t\mu(\{x/t\}) - (t-1)}.$$

This shows that x is an atom of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$ with the required mass.

As noted above, $F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x) = 0$ almost everywhere relative to the singular part of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$. We deduce that this singular part has finite support, and therefore it is purely atomic. The density of $\mu^{\boxplus t}$ is simply $\Im(1/F_{\mu^{\boxplus t}}(x))$, and is therefore continuous at all points where the denominator is not zero. The analyticity of this density follows from the analyticity of ω_t at points $x \in \mathbb{R}$ where $\omega_t(x) \notin \mathbb{R}$ (see Theorem 2.1 (5)). $\square$

In the following, we apply Theorems 2.2 and 2.1 to point out connections between free and boolean infinite divisibility and describe some properties of reciprocals of Cauchy transforms of infinitely divisible measures with respect to free additive convolution.

DEFINITION 2.4. *Given an arbitrary convolution $\star$, we say that a probability measure μ is infinitely divisible with respect to $\star$ if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a probability measure μ_n such that $\mu = \underbrace{\mu_n \star \cdots \star \mu_n}_{n \text{ times}}$.*

We shall denote by $\mathcal{ID}(\star)$ the set of all probability measures which are infinitely divisible with respect to the convolution $\star$.

In [10] Bercovici and Voiculescu have completely described infinitely divisible probability measures with respect to free additive convolution in terms of their R -transforms. We state the result below:

THEOREM 2.5.

- (i) *A probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ is $\boxplus$ -infinitely divisible if and only if φ_μ has an analytic extension defined on $\mathbb{C}^+$ with values in $-\mathbb{C}^+ \cup \mathbb{R}$.*
- (ii) *Let $\varphi: \mathbb{C}^+ \longrightarrow -\overline{\mathbb{C}^+}$ be an analytic function. Then φ is a continuation of φ_μ for some $\boxplus$ -infinitely divisible measure μ if and only if*

$$\lim_{z \xrightarrow[\prec]{} \infty} \frac{\varphi(z)}{z} = 0.$$

Next, we give an analytic characterization of boolean additive convolution (Definition 0.6, (a)), due to Speicher and Woroudi:

THEOREM 2.6. *Consider two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$F_{\mu \uplus \nu}(z) = F_\mu(z) + F_\nu(z) - z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

(It is easy to observe that the operation $\uplus$ is commutative and associative. However, unlike for classical and free additive convolutions, $\mu \uplus \delta_a$ is not usually equal to the shift of μ by the amount of a .)

Theorem 2.6 makes the following result of Speicher and Woroudi less surprising:

THEOREM 2.7. *All probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$ are infinitely divisible with respect to boolean additive convolution.*

We can now prove the following result:

PROPOSITION 2.8. *Fix a number $t > 1$. With the notations from Theorem 2.2, the following hold:*

- (a) *For any probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxplus)$, we have $\Re F_\mu(z) > 1/2$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and F_μ extends continuously to $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $\mu^{\text{sc}} = 0$, μ has at most one atom, and the density of μ^{ac} with respect to Lebesgue measure is analytic wherever positive;*
- (b) *The correspondence $H_t \longleftrightarrow \omega_t$ induces a bijective correspondence*

$$\Psi_t: \mathcal{ID}(\boxplus) \longrightarrow \mathcal{ID}(\boxplus),$$

with the property that $\Psi_t(\mu \uplus \nu) = \Psi_t(\mu) \boxplus \Psi_t(\nu)$ for all probability measures μ, ν .

PROOF. Assume $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxplus)$. By Theorem 2.5, φ_μ can be continued analytically to $\mathbb{C}^+$. Let us observe, by part (ii) of Theorem 2.5, the function $H(z) = z + \varphi_\mu(z)$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1, with $a = 1$. (Recall that $a = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} H(iy)/(iy)$.) Thus, there exists an analytic self-map ω of the upper half-plane such that $H(\omega(z)) = z$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. Applying ω to both sides of this equality gives $\omega(H(w)) = w$ for all $w \in \omega(\mathbb{C}^+)$. Part (4) of Theorem 2.1 implies that $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(iy)/(iy) \geq 1/2$, so we conclude that $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \omega(iy)/(iy) = 1$. But $F_\mu(H(z)) = z$ for z in some large enough truncated cone at infinity. We conclude that $\omega = F_\mu$, and by part (4) of Theorem 2.1, we obtain that $\Re F_\mu(z) > 1/2$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. The continuous extension of F_μ to $\mathbb{R}$ follows from part (2) of the same theorem.

By definition of infinite divisibility, we know that $\mu = \mu_{1/2} \boxplus \mu_{1/2}$ for some probability measure $\mu_{1/2}$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, the statements referring to the absolutely continuous and singular continuous parts of μ follow from parts (2) and (3) of Theorem 2.3. Finally, by part (1) of Theorem 2.3 we know that in order for x to be an atom of μ , we must have $F_\mu(x) = 0$. Since $\Re F_\mu(z) > 1/2$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, we conclude that this can happen for at most one $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This completes the proof of (a).

To prove (b), consider two arbitrary probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}$. Define $H_t^\mu(z) = tz + (1-t)F_\mu(z)$, $H_t^\nu(z) = tz + (1-t)F_\nu(z)$. As we have seen in the proof of (a), the right inverses ω_t^μ and ω_t^ν of H_t^μ and H_t^ν , respectively, are reciprocals of Cauchy transforms of probability measures which are infinitely divisible with respect to $\boxplus$; denote them by $\Psi_t(\mu)$ and $\Psi_t(\nu)$. Observe that, by its definition,

$$\varphi_{\Psi_t(\mu)}(z) = H_t^\mu(z) - z = (1-t)(F_\mu(z) - z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\Psi_t(\mu \boxplus \nu)}(z) &= H_t^{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) - z \\ &= (1-t)(F_{\mu \boxplus \nu}(z) - z) \\ &= (1-t)(F_\mu(z) - z + F_\nu(z) - z) \\ &= (H_t^\mu(z) - z) + (H_t^\nu(z) - z) \\ &= \varphi_{\Psi_t(\mu)}(z) + \varphi_{\Psi_t(\nu)}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+. \end{aligned}$$

(We have used Theorem 2.6 in the third equality.) We conclude by Theorem 1.19 that $\Psi_t(\mu \boxplus \nu) = \Psi_t(\mu) \boxplus \Psi_t(\nu)$. This shows that Ψ_t is an injective homomorphism. To show surjectivity, consider $\lambda \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxplus)$ and let $H(z) = z + \varphi_\lambda(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. By Theorem 2.5, we have $\Im H(z) \leq \Im z$ for all z in the upper half-plane, and $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} H(iy)/(iy) = 1$. Let

$$F(z) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{t-1}\right)z - \frac{1}{t-1}H(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Observe that

$$\Im F(z) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{t-1}\right)\Im z - \frac{1}{t-1}\Im H(z) \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{t-1}\right)\Im z - \frac{1}{t-1}\Im z = \Im z,$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{F(iy)}{iy} = 1 + \frac{1}{t-1} - \frac{1}{t-1} \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{H(iy)}{iy} = 1.$$

We conclude by Proposition 1.2 that there exists a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $F = F_\mu$. A computation similar to the one above shows that $\Psi_t(\mu) = \lambda$. $\square$

A somewhat weaker version of part (a) of the above theorem can be found in [11], while for $t = 2$, the morphism described in part (b) is the Bercovici-Pata bijection (see [8] for details).

2. Partially defined semigroups with respect to free multiplicative convolution on the unit circle

A result similar to the one from Theorem 2.2 holds for free multiplicative convolutions of measures supported on the unit circle. However, as we shall see below, it is not always possible to start the semigroup at $t = 1$, and the semigroup is not unique. We begin with an inversion theorem for maps defined in the unit disk.

THEOREM 2.9. *Let $\Phi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a meromorphic function such that $\Phi(0) = 0$ and $|\Phi(z)| \geq |z|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Then:*

- (1) *For every $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ there exists a unique $z \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\Phi(z) = \alpha$.*
- (2) *There exists a continuous function $\omega : \overline{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that $\omega(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$, $\omega|_{\mathbb{D}}$ is analytic, and $\Phi(\omega(z)) = z$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*
- (3) *For each $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $\omega(\alpha)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of the map $g_\alpha : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ defined by*

$$g_\alpha(z) = \frac{\alpha z}{\Phi(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$
- (4) *The function ω is one-to-one.*
- (5) *If $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ is such that $|\omega(\zeta)| < 1$, then ω can be continued analytically to a neighborhood of ζ .*

PROOF. If $\alpha = 0$, then $z = 0$ is indeed the unique point for which $\Phi(z) = 0$. Assume therefore that $\alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. The function g_α is analytic on $\mathbb{D}$, and

$$|g_\alpha(z)| \leq |\alpha| < 1, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

We conclude that the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α is in $\mathbb{D}$, and therefore there exists a unique $z_\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $g_\alpha(z_\alpha) = z_\alpha$, namely this Denjoy-Wolff point. Since

$$g_\alpha(0) = \frac{\alpha}{\Phi'(0)} \neq 0,$$

the point z_α cannot be zero, and therefore the equation $g_\alpha(z_\alpha) = z_\alpha$ is equivalent to $\Phi(z) = \alpha$. The function $\omega(\alpha) = z_\alpha$ is easily seen to be analytic.

To complete the proof of (2), we must show that for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, the limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} \omega(z)$ exists. We distinguish two cases:

- (a) There exists a sequence $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \zeta$ and the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$ exists and belongs to $\mathbb{D}$;
- (b) For any sequence $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \zeta$ and the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$ exists, this limit is in $\mathbb{T}$.

Assume first that (a) holds, and set $w = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$. We claim that $g_\zeta(w) = w$. Indeed,

$$\Phi(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\omega(\alpha_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \zeta.$$

We deduce that w is the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_ζ , and hence $|g'_\zeta(w)| \leq 1$, with strict inequality unless g_ζ is a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$. This last case means that

$$g_\zeta(z) = \beta \frac{z - \gamma}{1 - \bar{\gamma}z}$$

for some $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{D}$. In this case

$$\Phi(z) = \frac{\zeta}{\beta} z \frac{1 - \bar{\gamma}z}{z - \gamma}, \quad \Phi'(z) = \frac{\zeta}{\beta} \frac{-\bar{\gamma}z^2 + 2\gamma\bar{\gamma}z - \gamma}{(z - \gamma)^2}.$$

If $\gamma = re^{it}$, then the zeros of Φ' are equal to $e^{it}(r \pm i\sqrt{1-r^2})$. Both of these zeros are on the unit circle, so that $\Phi'(w) \neq 0$. We deduce that Φ is locally invertible at w , and the local inverse is an analytic continuation of ω to a neighborhood of ζ .

When g_ζ is not a conformal automorphism, we must have $|g'_\zeta(w)| < 1$. Since

$$g'_\zeta(w) = \zeta \frac{\Phi(w) - w\Phi'(w)}{\Phi(w)^2} = 1 - w \frac{\Phi'(w)}{\zeta},$$

we deduce that $\Phi'(w) \neq 0$, and the analytic continuation of ω at ζ is obtained as in the previous case.

This argument shows that, in case (a) holds, ω has an analytic, in particular continuous, continuation at ζ , which also proves assertion (5).

Next we deal with case (b). Assume that there exist two sequences $\alpha_n, \beta_n \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n = \zeta$, the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\beta_n)$ exist, and they are different. Choose a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ passing through all the points α_n, β_n , and such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = \zeta$. It follows from our assumption that there exists an open interval I in the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ such that every point $\xi \in I$ is of the form $\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))$, where $t_{\xi,n} \in [0, 1)$ for all n . Moreover, the sequence $\{t_{\xi,n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be chosen so that $\omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))/\xi > 0$, and thus $\omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))$ approaches ξ nontangentially. Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(\omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t_{\xi,n}) = \zeta,$$

we conclude that the nontangential limit of Φ at ξ is ζ for almost every $\xi \in I$. Privelov's theorem (Theorem 1.7) implies that Φ is identically equal to ζ . This however is not true because $\Phi(0) = 0$. This contradiction shows that the limit $\omega(\zeta) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \alpha, z \in \mathbb{D}} \omega(z)$ exists in case (b) as well.

We have already shown that $\omega(\alpha)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α provided that $|\alpha| < 1$. We will show that this is still true when $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{T}$, and denote by z_α the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α . If $|z_\alpha| < 1$, then $g_\alpha(z_\alpha) = z_\alpha$ so that $\Phi(z_\alpha) = \alpha$. Since Φ is analytic at z_α , hence open, there exist points z_r such that $\lim_{r \uparrow 1} z_r = z_\alpha$ and $\Phi(z_r) = r\alpha$ for r close to 1. However, property (1) shows that $\omega(r\alpha)$ is the only point in $\mathbb{D}$ such that $\Phi(\omega(r\alpha)) = r\alpha$. We deduce that

$$\omega(\alpha) = \lim_{r \uparrow 1} \omega(r\alpha) = \lim_{r \uparrow 1} z_r = z_\alpha,$$

as claimed.

On the other hand, if $|z_\alpha| = 1$, Julia's theorem shows that, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, g_α maps the horodisk $\{w \in \mathbb{C} : |w - (1 - \varepsilon)z_\alpha| < \varepsilon\}$ into itself. In particular, as g_α is not the identity map, $|g_\alpha((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha)| > 1 - 2\varepsilon$ and $|z_\alpha - g_\alpha((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha)| < 2\varepsilon$. Therefore

$$|\Phi((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha)| = \left| \frac{\alpha(1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha}{g_\alpha((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha)} \right| < 1$$

and $\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \Phi((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha) = \alpha$. We conclude that

$$\omega(\alpha) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \omega(\Phi((1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha)) = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} (1 - 2\varepsilon)z_\alpha = z_\alpha.$$

It remains to prove that ω is one-to-one on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. To do this, we observe first that for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, $\omega(\alpha)$ is the unique fixed point of g_α , and g_α is not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$ as

$$g_\alpha(\mathbb{D}) \subset \{z : |z| \leq |\alpha|\} \neq \mathbb{D}.$$

Thus $|g'_\alpha(\omega(\alpha))| < 1$, so that

$$\left| 1 - \omega(\alpha) \frac{\Phi'(\omega(\alpha))}{\alpha} \right| < 1.$$

Using the relation $\Phi'(\omega(\alpha)) = 1/\omega'(\alpha)$, the inequality becomes

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\omega(\alpha)}{\alpha\omega'(\alpha)} \right| < 1$$

which is equivalent to

$$\Re \left(\frac{\alpha\omega'(\alpha)}{\omega(\alpha)} \right) > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Consider now the logarithm of ω . More precisely, let $h : (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous function such that $e^{h(r,t)} = \omega(re^{it})$ for all r and t . We have

$$\frac{d}{dt} h(r, t) = i \frac{re^{it}\omega'(re^{it})}{\omega(re^{it})},$$

so that

$$\Im \frac{d}{dt} h(r, t) > \frac{1}{2}$$

provided that $r < 1$. This implies the inequality

$$|h(r, t_1) - h(r, t_2)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|t_1 - t_2|$$

whenever $r < 1$. This inequality extends by continuity to $r = 1$ as well. Assume now that $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < 2\pi$ are such that $\omega(e^{it_1}) = \omega(e^{it_2})$. In this case there must exist an integer k such that $h(1, t_1) = h(1, t_2 + 2k\pi)$, and this leads to a contradiction since $t_1 \neq t_2 + 2k\pi$. $\square$

As in Section 1, we use the above theorem to prove the existence of a partially defined free convolution semigroup of measures on $\mathbb{T}$.

THEOREM 2.10. *Consider a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ having nonzero first moment, and let $t > 1$ be a real number. Assume that the function η_μ never vanishes on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure μ_t on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta d\mu_t(\zeta) \neq 0$, and $\Sigma_{\mu_t}(z) = \Sigma_{\mu}(z)^t$ in a neighborhood of zero. Moreover, η_{μ_t} never vanishes on $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$.*
- (2) *There exists an analytic function $\omega_t : \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $|\omega_t(z)| \leq |z|$ and $\eta_{\mu_t}(z) = \eta_{\mu}(\omega_t(z))$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$.*
- (3) *We have*

$$\omega_t(z) = \eta_{\mu_t}(z) \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{1/t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

and $\Phi_t(\omega_t(z)) = z$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$, where

$$\Phi_t(z) = z \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu}(z)} \right]^{t-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

PROOF. The function Φ_t , defined as in (3), satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.9 (this is an immediate consequence of Proposition 1.38 and the hypothesis), which proves the existence of a right inverse ω_t for Φ_t . We define then $\eta_t = \eta_{\mu} \circ \omega_t$, and observe that $\eta_t = \eta_{\mu_t}$ for some measure μ_t on $\mathbb{T}$. Indeed, this follows immediatly from Theorem 2.9 (2) and Proposition 1.38. Clearly η_{μ_t} only vanishes for $z = 0$; this follows from the corresponding hypothesis on μ , and from the fact that ω_t is injective.

To conclude, we must verify the identities in (1) and (3). The inversion relation $\Phi_t(\omega_t(z)) = z$ amounts to

$$\omega_t(z) \left[\frac{\omega_t(z)}{\eta_{\mu}(\omega_t(z))} \right]^{t-1} = z,$$

or

$$\left[\frac{\omega_t(z)}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{t-1} = \frac{z}{\omega_t(z)}.$$

This can also be written as

$$\left[\frac{\omega_t(z)}{z} \right]^{t-1} \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{t-1} = \frac{z}{\omega_t(z)},$$

by injectivity of ω_t and the hypothesis on η_{μ} .

$$\left[\frac{\omega_t(z)}{z} \right]^t = \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{1-t} = \frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \left[\frac{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)}{z} \right]^t$$

and hence

$$\frac{\omega_t(z)}{z} = \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{1/t} \frac{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)}{z},$$

which verifies (3). Finally, if z is close to zero, we have

$$\begin{aligned} z\Sigma_{\mu_t}(z) &= \eta_{\mu_t}^{-1}(z) = \omega_t^{-1}(\eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z)) = \Phi_t(\eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z)) = \eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z) \left[\frac{\eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z)}{\eta_{\mu}(\eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z))} \right]^{t-1} \\ &= \eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z) \left[\frac{\eta_{\mu}^{-1}(z)}{z} \right]^{t-1} = z\Sigma_{\mu}(z)\Sigma_{\mu}(z)^{t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by z we obtain the desired relation $\Sigma_{\mu_t}(z) = \Sigma_{\mu}(z)^t$. $\square$

It seems natural to denote μ_t by $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$, but note that these measures are only determined up to a rotation by a multiple of $2\pi t$. This is due to the choice involved in extracting roots. In case η_{μ} has zeroes in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$, we are assured by Theorem 1.42 that $\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \mu}$ has no zeros in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, one can still define

$$\mu^{\boxtimes t} = (\mu \boxtimes \mu)^{\boxtimes(t/2)},$$

at least for $t > 2$. It will still be true that $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}} = \eta_{\mu} \circ \omega_t$ for some conformal map ω_t , but ω_t might not have a globally defined left inverse. Its left inverse $z(z/\eta_{\mu}(z))^{t-1}$ is however the composition of two functions defined on $\mathbb{D}$ because ω_t is the composition of two functions which do have global left inverses.

Let us also observe that whenever $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta d\mu(\zeta) = 0$, μ_t is defined for any $t \geq 2$, and equals the uniform distribution (the Haar measure) on $\mathbb{T}$.

In the following, we shall discuss regularity properties of measures μ_t , $t > 1$. As we have observed at the beginning of Section 1.3 of the previous chapter, in the case of probability measures μ on $\mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\psi_{\mu}(z) + \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\mu(e^{-it}), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

The real part of this function is the Poisson integral of the measure $d\mu(e^{-it})$, and therefore this measure can be obtained as the weak*-limit of the measures

$$d\nu_r(e^{it}) = \Re \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\psi_{\mu}(re^{it}) + \frac{1}{2} \right) dt$$

as $r \uparrow 1$. In particular, the functions $(1/\pi)\Re(\psi_{\mu}(re^{it}) + 1/2)$ converge dt -a.e. to the density of $\mu(e^{-it})$, and they converge to infinity a.e. relative to the singular part of this measure. A number $1/\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ is an atom of μ if and only if $\eta_{\mu}(\zeta) = 1$ and the Julia-Carathéodory derivative $\eta'_{\mu}(\zeta)$ is finite (this follows from Lemma 1.32 and Theorem 1.13). In this case

this derivative is still given by

$$\zeta \eta'_\mu(\zeta) = \frac{1}{\mu(\{1/\zeta\})}.$$

In the following result we will assume that a choice of arguments has been made so that the results of Theorem 2.10 are correct. When t is an integer, the following result is true without the assumption that η_μ have no zeros different from 0.

THEOREM 2.11. *Let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\eta'_\mu(0) \neq 0$, η_μ has no zeros in $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$, and let $t > 1$. Consider the measure $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$ provided by Theorem 2.10, and the corresponding functions Φ_t and ω_t*

- (1) *A point $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfies $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$ if and only if $\omega_t(\zeta) \in \mathbb{T}$ and $1/\omega_t(\zeta)$ is an atom of μ with mass $\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) \geq (t-1)/t$. If $\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) > (t-1)/t$, then $1/\zeta$ is an atom of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$, and*

$$\mu^{\boxtimes t}(\{1/\zeta\}) = t\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) - (t-1).$$

If $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$, there is a real number θ such that $\zeta = e^{i\theta}$ and $\omega_t(\zeta) = e^{i\theta/t}$.

- (2) *The nonatomic part of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$ is absolutely continuous, and its density is continuous except at the (finitely many) points ζ such that $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$.*
- (3) *The density of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$ is analytic at all points where it is different from zero.*

PROOF. As in the proof of Theorem 2.3, (2) and (3) follow easily from the continuity and analyticity properties of ω_t , once (1) is established. The formulas

$$\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(z) = \eta_\mu(\omega_t(z)) = z \left[\frac{\omega_t(z)}{z} \right]^{\frac{t}{t-1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

show that $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}$ extends continuously to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, and these equalities persist when $z \in \mathbb{T}$ even if $|\omega_t(z)| = 1$, provided that $\eta_\mu(\omega_t(z))$ is viewed as a nontangential limit. This being said, let $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfy $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$. The above formulas show that $|\omega_t(\zeta)| = 1$, and in fact $\omega_t(\zeta)$ is one of the $(1/t)$ -powers of ζ . Since, according to Theorem 2.9, $\omega_t(\zeta)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of the function $g_\zeta(z) = \zeta z / \Phi_t(z)$, we see, by Theorem 1.14, that $\Phi_t(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \zeta$, and

$$\frac{\omega_t(\zeta)}{\zeta} \Phi'_t(\omega_t(\zeta)) \geq 0.$$

We will treat this derivative a little more carefully, on account of the fractional powers involved. We have

$$\frac{\Phi'_t(z)}{\Phi_t(z)} = \frac{t}{z} - (t-1)\frac{\eta'_\mu(z)}{\eta_\mu(z)}.$$

Replacing z by $\omega_t(\zeta)$, and using the equalities $\Phi_t(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \zeta$ and $\eta_\mu(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{\omega_t(\zeta)}{\zeta} \Phi'_t(\omega_t(\zeta)) = t - (t-1)\omega_t(\zeta)\eta'_\mu(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \frac{t\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) - (t-1)}{\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\})}.$$

This number is nonnegative precisely when $\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) \geq (t-1)/t$. Conversely, if $\omega_t(\zeta) \in \mathbb{T}$, and $\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) \geq (t-1)/t$, then the above calculation will show that Φ_t has nonnegative Julia-Carathéodory derivative at $\omega_t(\zeta)$, and, since $g_\zeta(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \omega_t(\zeta)$, we conclude that $\omega_t(\zeta)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_ζ , so that $\Phi_t(\omega_t(\zeta)) = \zeta$. This implies $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(\zeta) = 1$. The mass $\mu^{\boxtimes t}(\{1/\zeta\})$ can then be calculated using the chain rule in case $\mu(\{1/\omega_t(\zeta)\}) > (t-1)/t$, as in the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\square$

A connection similar to the one presented in Proposition 2.8 exists for measures on the unit circle. We present first an analytic characterization of multiplicative boolean convolution (Definition 0.6 (b)), due to Franz [21]:

THEOREM 2.12. *Consider two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{T}$. We have*

$$z\eta_{\mu \boxtimes \nu}(z) = \eta_\mu(z)\eta_\nu(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Unlike in the additive case, not all probability measures are infinitely divisible with respect to multiplicative boolean convolution, as the following theorem of Franz shows (see [21], Theorem 3.6):

THEOREM 2.13. *A probability measure μ on the unit circle, different from the Haar measure, is infinitely divisible with respect to multiplicative boolean convolution if and only if there exists a real number $b \in [0, 2\pi)$ and a finite measure ρ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that*

$$\eta_\mu(z) = z \exp \left(ib - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{e^{it} + z}{e^{it} - z} d\rho(e^{it}) \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}$$

Observe that, if μ is the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$, then $\eta_\mu(z) = 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$, and thus μ is infinitely divisible with respect to $\boxtimes$.

We state below the analogue of Theorem 2.5 for free multiplicative convolution, as it appears in [9], Theorem 6.7:

THEOREM 2.14.

- (i) *A probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ with nonzero first moment is infinitely divisible if and only if there exists a function $u(z)$, analytic in $\mathbb{D}$, such that $\Re u(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\Sigma_\mu(z) = \exp(u(z))$.*
- (ii) *Let $u: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow -i\mathbb{C}^+$ be an analytic function. Then the function $\Sigma(z) = \exp(u(z))$ has the form $\Sigma = \Sigma_\mu$ for some $\boxtimes$ -infinitely divisible measure μ with nonzero first moment.*

As in the case of multiplicative boolean convolution, we observe that the uniform distribution is also infinitely divisible with respect to $\boxtimes$.

PROPOSITION 2.15. *Fix a number $t > 1$. With the notations from Theorem 2.10, the following hold:*

- (a) *For any $\boxtimes$ -infinitely divisible probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$, different from the uniform distribution on the unit circle, η_μ extends continuously to $\mathbb{T}$, and the extension is injective. Moreover, $\mu^{sc} = 0$, μ has at most one atom, and the density of μ^{ac} with respect to the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$ is analytic wherever positive;*
- (b) *The correspondence $\Phi_t \longleftrightarrow \omega_t$ induces a bijective correspondence*

$$\Psi_t: \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes) \longrightarrow \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes),$$

with the property that $\Psi_t(\mu \boxtimes \nu) = \Psi_t(\mu) \boxtimes \Psi_t(\nu)$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$.

PROOF. Assume $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$. By definition, $\mu = \mu_{1/2} \boxtimes \mu_{1/2}$ for some probability measure $\mu_{1/2}$ on $\mathbb{T}$ with nonzero first moment. Thus, by Theorem 2.11, $\mu^{sc} = 0$, and μ^{ac} has analytic density with respect to the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$. To prove injectivity of η_μ , observe that, by Theorem 2.14, $\Sigma_\mu = \exp \circ u$ for some analytic function u on $\mathbb{D}$ with $\Re u(z) \geq 0$, $|z| < 1$. We claim that the function $\Phi(z) = z\Sigma_\mu(z)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 2.9. Indeed, $\Phi(0) = 0$ trivially, and

$$|\Phi(z)| = |z| |\exp(u(z))| \geq |z| e^{\Re u(z)} \geq |z|, \quad z \in \mathbb{D},$$

by Theorem 2.14 (i). Thus, there exists an analytic self-map of the unit disk ω such that $\Phi(\omega(z)) = z$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Applying ω to both sides of the equality gives $\omega(\Phi(w)) = w$ for all $w \in \omega(\mathbb{D})$. Since $\Phi(z) = 0$ if and only if $z = 0$, we must also have $\omega(0) = 0$. But $\eta_\mu(\Phi(z)) = z$ for z in some neighbourhood of 0. We conclude that $\eta_\mu = \omega$, and thus, by part (4) of Theorem 2.9, we conclude that η_μ extends as a continuous injective function to $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Finally, by part (1) of Theorem 2.11, we know that in order for $x \in \mathbb{T}$ to be an atom of μ , we must have $\eta_\mu(x) = 1$. The injectivity of η_μ implies that this can happen for at most one $x \in \mathbb{T}$. This proves part (a) of the proposition.

To prove part (b), consider two arbitrary probability measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$. Assume first that neither of them is the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$. Define

$$\Phi_t^\mu(z) = z \left[\frac{z}{\eta_\mu(z)} \right]^{t-1}, \quad \Phi_t^\nu(z) = z \left[\frac{z}{\eta_\nu(z)} \right]^{t-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Observe that, by Theorem 2.13, the above functions are indeed well-defined, and $|\Phi_t^\mu(z)| \geq |z|$, $|\Phi_t^\nu(z)| \geq |z|$. As we have seen in the proof of (a), there exist probability measures, denote them by $\Psi_t(\mu)$ and $\Psi_t(\nu)$ such that the $\omega_t^\mu = \eta_{\Psi_t(\mu)}$, and $\omega_t^\nu = \eta_{\Psi_t(\nu)}$, where $\omega_t^\mu, \omega_t^\nu$ denote the right inverses of Φ_t^μ and Φ_t^ν , respectively, provided by Theorem 2.10. We claim that $\Psi_t(\mu), \Psi_t(\nu) \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$. Indeed, on some neighbourhood of zero we have $\eta_{\Psi_t(\mu)}(\Phi_t^\mu(z)) = z$, and hence $\Sigma_{\Psi_t(\mu)}(z) = \Phi_t^\mu(z)/z = (z/\eta_\mu(z))^{t-1}$. By analytic continuation, this equality holds for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. In particular, the function

$$u(z) = (t-1) \log \frac{z}{\eta_\mu(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}$$

is well-defined, analytic, and $\Sigma_{\Psi_t(\mu)}(z) = \exp(u(z))$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Of course, $|z/\eta_\mu(z)| \geq 1$ implies that $\Re u(z) = \exp(|u(z)|) = \exp((t-1)|\log(z/\eta_\mu(z))|) \geq 0$. We conclude by Theorem 2.14 that $\Psi_t(\mu) \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$. Similarly, $\Psi_t(\nu) \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$.

Assume now that μ is the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$. We define $\Psi_t(\mu) = \mu$. Observe that in this case $\Psi_t(\mu \boxtimes \nu) = \mu = \Psi_t(\mu) \boxtimes \Psi_t(\nu)$. We have thus proved that Ψ_t is an injective homomorphism. To show surjectivity, let $\lambda \in \mathcal{ID}(\boxtimes)$. We may assume without loss of generality that λ is not the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{T}$. By Theorem 2.14, $\Sigma_\lambda(z) = \exp(u(z))$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, for some analytic function u such that $\Re u(z) \geq 0$. Let $\Phi(z) = z\Sigma(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. We

obviously have $|\Phi(z)| \geq |z|$, and $\Phi(0) = 0$. Define

$$\eta(z) = z \left[\frac{z}{\Phi(z)} \right]^{\frac{1}{t-1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Observe that $\eta(z) = z(\exp(u(z)))^{\frac{1}{1-t}} = z \exp(u(z)/(1-t))$, and thus $\eta(0) = 0$, and

$$|\eta(z)| \leq |z|(\exp(\Re u(z)))^{\frac{1}{1-t}} \leq |z|, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

We conclude by Proposition 1.25 that there exists a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\eta = \eta_\mu$. Also, the function $u(z)/(1-t)$ satisfies the condition $\Re u(z)/(1-t) \leq 0$, and thus, by Proposition 1.37, is of the form $u(z)/(1-t) = ib - \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{e^{it}+z}{e^{it}-z} d\rho(e^{it})$ for some positive finite measure ρ on $\mathbb{T}$, and some number $b \in [0, 2\pi)$. We conclude by Theorem 2.13 that $\mu \in \mathcal{ID}(\otimes)$. The computation above shows that $\Psi_t(\mu) = \lambda$. $\square$

3. Partially defined semigroups with respect to free multiplicative convolution on the positive half-line

The results that will be presented in this section are similar to the ones in the previous sections. As before, we shall start with an inversion theorem, this time for maps defined on the slit complex plane.

The covering map $u : \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ defined by $u(z) = -e^z$ provides a conformal map of the strip $\mathcal{S}_\pi = \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : |y| < \pi\}$ onto $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. Call $v : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_\pi$ the inverse of this conformal map. For any function $\Phi : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ there exists therefore a function $f : \mathcal{S}_\pi \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Phi = u \circ f \circ v$. When $\Phi((-\infty, 0)) \subset (-\infty, 0)$, the function f is uniquely determined if we require it to be real-valued on $\mathbb{R}$ or, equivalently, $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$, $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$. Thus, inversion results for functions defined on $\mathcal{S}_\pi$ can be naturally formulated for maps on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$. We will consider analytic functions defined in the band $\mathcal{S}_\pi = \{x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : |y| < \pi\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, which is of course conformally equivalent to the right half-plane, the equivalence being realized by $\varphi : \mathcal{S}_\pi \longrightarrow -i\mathbb{C}^+$, $\varphi(z) = e^{z/2}$. The map φ sends $+\infty$ to $+\infty$ and $-\infty$ to zero, and from this one can easily deduce what the Julia-Carathéodory derivatives should be at $\pm\infty$. For a function $g : \mathcal{S}_\pi \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}_\pi$ they are

$$\lim_{x \uparrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(g(x))}{\varphi(x)} = \lim_{x \uparrow \infty} e^{(x-g(x))/2}$$

at $+\infty$, and

$$\lim_{x \downarrow -\infty} e^{(g(x)-x)/2}$$

at $-\infty$. In order to use Julia's theorem, we will need to look at the horodisks associated with a point $x + i\pi \in \partial\mathcal{S}_\pi$. If D is such a horodisk, then $\varphi(D)$ is an ordinary disk contained in the right-half-plane, and tangent to the imaginary axis at the point $e^{x/2}i$. The point in (the boundary of) D with the lowest imaginary part corresponds with the point in $\varphi(D)$ with lowest argument. If $\varphi(w)$ is this point, then the segment $[0, \varphi(w)]$ must be tangent to $\varphi(D)$ at $\varphi(w)$, and therefore it must have the same length as the other tangent from the origin, namely $[0, e^{x/2}i]$. We deduce that $|\varphi(w)| = e^{x/2}$, so that $\Re w = x$. It is easy to see that any point in $\mathcal{S}_\pi$, with real part x , is the lowest point in some horodisk. The consequence we will use is as follows: if $g : \mathcal{S}_\pi \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\pi$ is an analytic function with Denjoy-Wolff point $x + i\pi$, then $\Im(g(x + iy)) \geq y$ for $y \in (0, \pi)$.

THEOREM 2.16. *Consider an analytic function $f : \mathcal{S}_\pi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with the property that $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$. Assume that there exists a number $k > 1$ such that $\lim_{t \downarrow -\infty} (kt + f(t)) = -\infty$ and $\Im z \leq \Im f(z) \leq k\Im z$ for all $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$ with $\Im z > 0$. Then:*

- (1) *For every $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$ there exists a unique $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$ such that $f(z) = \alpha$.*
- (2) *There exists a continuous function $\omega : \overline{\mathcal{S}_\pi} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{S}_\pi}$ such that $\omega(\mathcal{S}_\pi) \subset \mathcal{S}_\pi$, $\omega|_{\mathcal{S}_\pi}$ is analytic, $|\Im \omega(z)| \leq |\Im z|$, $\omega(\bar{z}) = \overline{\omega(z)}$, and $f(\omega(z)) = z$ for $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$.*
- (3) *For each $\alpha \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\pi}$, $\omega(\alpha)$ is the Denjoy-Wolff point of the map $g_\alpha : \mathcal{S}_\pi \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\pi$ defined by*

$$g_\alpha(z) = z - \tau(f(z) - \alpha), \quad z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi,$$

where $\tau = \pi/(k + \pi)$.

- (4) *The function ω satisfies*

$$|\omega(z_1) - \omega(z_2)| \geq \frac{\tau}{2}|z_1 - z_2|, \quad z_1, z_2 \in \overline{\mathcal{S}_\pi}.$$

In particular, ω is one-to-one.

- (5) *If $\alpha \in \partial\mathcal{S}_\pi$ is such that $\omega(\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$, then ω can be continued analytically to a neighborhood of α .*

PROOF. Let us show that the functions g_α map $\mathcal{S}_\pi$ into itself. We clearly have, from the properties of f , that

$$\frac{k}{k+\pi}\Im z + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha \geq \Im g_\alpha(z) \geq \Im z - \frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha, \quad \Im z \geq 0,$$

and

$$\frac{k}{k+\pi}\Im z + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha \leq \Im g_\alpha(z) \leq \Im z + \frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha, \quad \Im z \leq 0.$$

The left-hand side of these inequalities is a convex combination of $\Im z$ and $\Im \alpha$, and hence is in $(-\pi, \pi)$. For the right-hand sides we observe that

$$\Im z - \frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha \geq -\frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} - \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha \geq -\frac{\pi k + \pi^2}{k+\pi} = -\pi$$

for $\Im z \geq 0$, and

$$\Im z + \frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\Im \alpha \leq \frac{\pi k}{k+\pi} + \frac{\pi}{k+\pi}\alpha \leq \frac{\pi k + \pi^2}{k+\pi} = \pi$$

for $\Im z \leq 0$. Observe that

$$f'(x) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x+iy) - f(x)}{iy} \geq \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{\Im f(x+iy)}{y} \geq 1$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$\lim_{x \uparrow +\infty} e^{(x-g_\alpha(x))/2} = \lim_{x \uparrow +\infty} e^{\pi(f(x)-\alpha)/2(\pi+k)} = +\infty,$$

and similarly

$$\lim_{x \downarrow -\infty} e^{(g_\alpha(x)-x)/2} = +\infty.$$

We conclude that the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α is not $\pm\infty$, with the possible exception when f is a real multiple of the identity map. If $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$, then, by the above inequalities,

$$g(\mathcal{S}_\pi) \subseteq \left\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |\Im z| \leq \pi \frac{k + \Im \alpha}{k + \pi} \right\},$$

so the Denjoy-Wolff point of g_α belongs to $\mathcal{S}_\pi$. Denote by z_α this point. It is clear that $f(z_\alpha) = \alpha$. The function $\omega(\alpha) = z_\alpha$ is clearly an analytic self-map of $\mathcal{S}_\pi$. This proves (1) and parts of (2) and (3).

We wish now to show that the function ω has a continuous extension to $\overline{\mathcal{S}_\pi}$. Fix $\alpha \in \partial \mathcal{S}_\pi$ and, as in the case of the disk, consider two cases:

- (a) There exists a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\pi$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \alpha$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$ exists and belongs to $\mathcal{S}_\pi$;

- (b) For any sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\pi$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \alpha$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(z_n)$ exists, this limit is in $\partial \mathcal{S}_\pi$.

If (a) holds and we set $w = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$, it is immediate that

$$f(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\omega(\alpha_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \alpha.$$

This implies that w is a fixed point for g_α , and therefore $w = z_\alpha$. The map g_α is never a conformal automorphism. Indeed, we have

$$g'_\alpha(x) = 1 - \frac{\pi}{k + \pi} f'(x) \geq 1 - \frac{k}{k + \pi},$$

and this implies that $\pm\infty$ are fixed points for g_α . The only conformal automorphisms of $\mathcal{S}_\pi$ with this property are translations $g(z) = z + c$, with $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and it is obvious g_α does not have this form. We conclude that

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\pi}{k + \pi} f'(w) \right| = |g'_\alpha(w)| < 1,$$

and therefore $f'(w) \neq 0$. Thus f is locally invertible at w , and the local inverse continues ω analytically in a neighborhood of α . Thus we have proved (5), the continuity of ω at α , as well as assertion (3) in case (a).

Assume now that (b) holds, and that there exist two sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{S}_\pi$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n = \alpha$, the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\alpha_n)$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\beta_n)$ exist, and they are different. Choose a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\pi$ passing through all the points α_n, β_n , and such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1} \gamma(t) = \alpha$. It follows from our assumption that there exists an open interval I in $\partial \mathcal{S}_\pi$ such that every point $\xi \in I$ is of the form $\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))$, where $t_{\xi,n} \in [0, 1)$ for all n . Moreover, $t_{\xi,n}$ can be chosen so that $\Re \omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n})) = \Re \xi$, and thus $\omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))$ approaches ξ nontangentially. Since

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(\omega(\gamma(t_{\xi,n}))) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(t_{\xi,n}) = \alpha,$$

we conclude that the nontangential limit of f at ξ is α for almost every $\xi \in I$. As f takes values in the band $\mathcal{S}_k = (k/\pi)\mathcal{S}_\pi$, which is conformally equivalent to a disk, Theorem 1.7 can be used to deduce that f is identically equal to α . This however is not true because $f(0) \in \mathbb{R}$. This contradiction shows that the limit $\omega(\alpha) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \alpha, z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi} \omega(z)$ exists in case (b) as well.

We will show next that assertion (3) is also verified in case (b). Let us note first that the point z_α cannot belong to $\mathcal{S}_\pi$ in this case. If it did, we would have $f(z_\alpha) = \alpha$, and we would deduce as before that f is invertible in a neighborhood of z_α , and the local inverse continues ω , which would place us in case (a) instead of (b). Thus z_α is in $\partial\mathcal{S}_\pi$. Let us assume, for definiteness, that $\Im\alpha = \pi$, in which case we must also have $\Im z_\alpha = \pi$. As in the previous arguments, g_α maps each horodisk at z_α into itself. As noted before the statement of the theorem, this implies that, with $x = \Re z_\alpha$ and $y \in (0, \pi)$, $g_\alpha(x + iy)$ is a point close to z_α if y is close to π , and with greater imaginary part. It follows that $f(x + iy) \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$, and $\lim_{y \uparrow \pi} f(x + iy) = \alpha$. One concludes as before that $\omega(\alpha) = z_\alpha$.

Finally, for $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$ we have

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\pi}{k + \pi} \frac{1}{\omega'(\alpha)} \right| = \left| 1 - \frac{\pi}{k + \pi} f'(z_\alpha) \right| = |g'_\alpha(z_\alpha)| \leq 1,$$

which implies that

$$\Re \omega'(\alpha) \geq \frac{\pi}{2(k + \pi)}.$$

This implies assertion (4), first in $\mathcal{S}_\pi$, and then by continuity in the closure of the domain. $\square$

As in the previous sections, we shall apply the above theorem to prove for each probability measure μ on $[0, +\infty)$ the existence of a family $\{\mu_t : t \geq 1\}$ such that $\mu_1 = \mu$ and $\mu_{s+t} = \mu_s \boxtimes \mu_t$.

THEOREM 2.17. *Let $\mu \neq \delta_0$ be a probability measure on $[0, +\infty)$, and let $t \geq 1$ be a real number.*

- (1) *There exists a probability measure $\mu_t \neq \delta_0$ on $[0, +\infty)$ such that $\Sigma_{\mu_t}(z) = \Sigma_\mu(z)^t$ for $z < 0$ sufficiently close to zero.*
- (2) *There exists an analytic self-map of the slit complex plane $\omega_t : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$ such that $\omega_t((-\infty, 0)) \subset (-\infty, 0)$, $\omega_t(0-) = 0$, $\arg \omega_t(z) \in [\arg(z), \pi)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and $\eta_{\mu_t}(z) = \eta_\mu(\omega_t(z))$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$.*
- (3) *The function ω_t is given by*

$$\omega_t(z) = \eta_{\mu_t}(z) \left[\frac{z}{\eta_{\mu_t}(z)} \right]^{1/t}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty),$$

where the power is taken to be positive for $z < 0$.

- (4) The analytic function $\Phi_t : \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ defined by

$$\Phi_t(z) = z \left[\frac{z}{\eta_\mu(z)} \right]^{t-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty),$$

satisfies $\Phi_t(\omega_t(z)) = z$ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty)$.

PROOF. Consider the analytic function f provided by the argument before Theorem 2.16, such that $\Phi_t = u \circ f \circ v$. As $\Phi((-\infty, 0)) \subseteq (-\infty, 0)$, the function f will be uniquely determined by the requirement that $f(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Observe that $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} (2t-1)x + f(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} v(x^{(2t-1)} \Phi_t(-x)^{-1}) = -\infty$, since $\lim_{x \uparrow 0} x^{2t-2} (\eta_\mu(x)/x)^{t-1} = 0$, as it follows from the definition of η_μ . Moreover, since $\arg \Phi_t(z) \in (t \arg z - (t-1)\pi, \arg z]$, we conclude that $\Im z \leq \Im f(z) \leq (2t-1)\Im z$. Thus, we can apply Theorem 2.16 to f to obtain a function ω such that $f(\omega(z)) = z$, $z \in \mathcal{S}_\pi$. An argument similar to the one in the proof of Theorem 2.10 shows that the function $\omega_t = u \circ \omega \circ v$ will satisfy the required conditions. $\square$

A regularity result similar to the ones in Theorems 2.3 and 2.11 holds for semigroups of probability measures on $[0, +\infty)$. Since the proof is different from the proofs of the above mentioned theorems, we omit it.

THEOREM 2.18. Let μ be a probability measure on $[0, +\infty)$, and let $t > 1$.

- (1) A point $x \in (0, +\infty)$ satisfies $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(x) = 1$ if and only if $x^{-1/t}$ is an atom of μ with mass $\mu(\{x^{-1/t}\}) \geq (t-1)/t$. If $\mu(\{x^{-1/t}\}) > (t-1)/t$, then $1/x$ is an atom of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$, and

$$\mu^{\boxtimes t}(\{1/x\}) = t\mu(\{x^{-1/t}\}) - (t-1).$$

- (2) The nonatomic part of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$ is absolutely continuous, and its density is continuous except at the (finitely many) points x such that $\eta_{\mu^{\boxtimes t}}(x) = 1$.
- (3) The density of $\mu^{\boxtimes t}$ is analytic at all points where it is different from zero.

CHAPTER 3

On monotonic infinite divisibility

In this chapter we improve results of Muraki related to probability measures which infinitely divisible with respect to monotonic convolutions. Our main tools will be two theorems of Ch. Pommerenke and N. Baker, which provide solutions to the Abel equation for self-maps of the upper half-plane: given an analytic function f , we say that ϕ satisfies the Abel equation if there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\phi(f(z)) = \phi(z) + c$ for all z in the domain of f .

Muraki has given in [25] an analytic method to compute additive monotonic convolutions (recall Definition 0.7) of probability measures on the real line in terms of the reciprocals of their Cauchy transforms:

THEOREM 3.1. *Let μ, ν be two probability measures on $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$F_{\mu \triangleright \nu}(z) = F_{\mu}(F_{\nu}(z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

(For another proof of this theorem, see [7].) As definition 2.4 makes clear, a probability measure μ will be infinitely divisible with respect to $\triangleright$ if and only if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a probability measure μ_n such that $F_{\mu}(z) = F_{\mu_n}^{\circ n}(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. (Recall that for a given self-map f of a domain D , $f^{\circ n}$ denotes the n -fold composition of f with itself: $f^{\circ n}(z) = \underbrace{f(f(\dots f(z)\dots))}_{n \text{ times}}.$) Muraki has shown that for compactly supported measures infinite divisibility of μ is equivalent to the embedability of F_{μ} into a composition semigroup, i.e. a family $\{F_t: t \in [0, +\infty)\}$ of reciprocals of Cauchy transforms of probability measures such that $F_0 = F_{\delta_0}$, $F_1 = F_{\mu}$, and $F_{s+t} = F_s \circ F_t$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.

Denote by H the right half-plane, $H = -i\mathbb{C}^+$, and consider an analytic function $f: H \rightarrow H$ such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x)/x = 1$. Following Pommerenke, we denote

$$f^{\circ n}(1) = z_n = x_n + iy_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and

$$q_n = \frac{z_{n+1} - z_n}{z_{n+1} + \bar{z}_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Pick's inequality, $|q_{n+1}| \leq |q_n|$, so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q_n|$ exists and is finite. One can find two different types of solutions to the Abel equation for f , depending on whether q_n tends to zero or not. The following two theorems from [27] and [2] make this statement more precise.

THEOREM 3.2. *With the above notations, let $k_n: H \rightarrow H$,*

$$k_n(z) = \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - iy_n}{x_n}, \quad z \in H, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- (i) *The limit $k(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n(z)$, $z \in H$ exists locally uniformly, $k(z) \in H$, and there exists a number $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $k(f(z)) = k(z) + ib$, $z \in H$.*
- (ii) *$k(f(1)) = f(1)$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_n = 0$. In this case $k(z) = 1$ for all $z \in H$.*
- (iii) *Assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q_n| > 0$ and fix $d \in (0, 1)$. Then $|y_n| \rightarrow \infty$, $x_n/x_{n+1} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that k is injective on*

$$U_{f,m}^d = \{z \in H: \exists n \geq m, dx_n \leq \Re z \leq x_n/d, \Im z \text{ between } y_n \text{ and } y_{n+1}\}.$$

Furthermore, $\Re k(x + iy) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $x/x_n \rightarrow +\infty$, and y is between y_n and y_{n+1} , $n \rightarrow \infty$.

It is remarkable that the convergence of $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is eventually monotonic, since $b = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (y_{n+1} - y_n)/x_n$. For details we refer to [27], page 443.

THEOREM 3.3. *With the above notations, let*

$$h_n(z) = \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+1} - z_n}, \quad z \in H, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Assume that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q_n| = 0$.

- (i) *The limit $h(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z)$, $z \in H$ exists locally uniformly in H , and satisfies $h(f(z)) = h(z) + 1$, $z \in H$.*
- (ii) *The function h is injective in*

$$G_m = \bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} \{x + iy: x > x_k/2, |y - y_k| < x_k\}.$$

For proofs, we refer to [27] and [2], respectively.

One can obviously apply Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 to self-maps of the upper half-plane, via the transformation $z \mapsto if(-iz)$. We shall use these two theorems to prove that analytic self-maps of the upper half-plane that have the Julia-Carathéodory derivative at infinity equal to 1 can have at most one “square root” with respect to composition.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let $f, g: \mathbb{C}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^+$ be two analytic self-maps of the upper half-plane such that $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} f(iy)/(iy) = \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} g(iy)/(iy) = 1$. If $f \circ f = g \circ g$, then $f = g$.*

PROOF. Consider the following two self-maps of the right half-plane: $\tilde{f}(z) = -if(iz)$, $\tilde{g}(z) = -ig(iz)$, $z \in H$. Since $\tilde{f} = \tilde{g}$ if and only if $f = g$, we can reformulate the proposition in terms of self-maps of the right half-plane. So, consider f and g to be self-maps of the left half-plane H . Denote

$$f^{\circ n}(1) = z_n = x_n + iy_n, \quad g^{\circ n}(1) = w_n = u_n + iv_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

and let

$$q_n = (z_{n+1} - z_n)/(z_{n+1} + \overline{z_n}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We shall consider separately the cases when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q_n| > 0$ and when $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |q_n| = 0$, corresponding to Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, respectively.

Assume first that $\{q_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded away from zero. In this case

$$k_{2n}(z) = \frac{f^{\circ 2n}(z) - iy_{2n}}{x_{2n}} = \frac{g^{\circ 2n}(z) - iy_{2n}}{x_{2n}}, \quad z \in H, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

converges to a nonconstant function k with the property that $k(f(z)) = k(g(z)) = k(z) + ib$ for some real number $b \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, assume that $y_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As noted after Theorem 3.2, the sequences $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ tend either to $+\infty$, or to $-\infty$. Since $y_{2n} = v_{2n}$, the limit must be the same; we assume for definiteness that it is $+\infty$. By Theorem 3.2, the sequences $\{x_{n+1}/x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{u_{n+1}/u_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ tend to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so there exists $m > 0$ such that both these sequences have all their terms at distance less than $1/4$ from 1 for $n \geq m$. We shall choose $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $y_n < y_{n+1} < \dots$, $v_n < v_{n+1} < \dots$, and $u_n \in ((1/2)u_{n-1}, 2u_{n-1})$, $x_n \in ((1/2)x_{n-1}, 2x_{n-1})$ for $n \geq m_1$.

Observe that, since $x_{2n} = u_{2n}$ and $y_{2n} = v_{2n}$, for $n \geq m_1$, we have

$$\left\{ x + iy : \frac{1}{2}x_{2n} \leq x \leq 2x_{2n}, y_{2n} \leq y \leq y_{2n+1} \right\} \cap \left\{ x + iy : \frac{1}{2}u_{2n} \leq x \leq 2u_{2n}, v_{2n} \leq y \leq v_{2n+1} \right\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Moreover, for $n \geq m_1$, either $z_{2n+1} \in \{x + iy : (1/2)u_{2n} < x < 2u_{2n}, v_{2n} < y < v_{2n+1}\}$, or $w_{2n+1} \in \{x + iy : (1/2)x_{2n} < x < 2x_{2n}, y_{2n} < y < y_{2n+1}\}$. Choose now $n > m_1$ to be large enough so that k is injective on $U_{f,n}^{1/2}$. Since $k(w_{2n+1}) = k(z_{2n+1})$ and both w_{2n+1} and z_{2n+1} belong to $U_{f,n}^{1/2}$, we conclude that $w_{2n+1} = z_{2n+1}$. This is true for all n large enough. Consider a neighbourhood V of z_{2n} . It is clear that the nonempty open set $f(V) \cap g(V)$ will be included in $\{x + iy : (1/2)u_{2n} < x < 2u_{2n}, v_{2n} < y < v_{2n+1}\} \cup \{x + iy : (1/2)u_{2n+1} < x < 2u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1} < y < v_{2n+2}\}$, if V is small enough. But this will imply that for any $z \in V$ we have $k(f(z)) = k(z) + ib = k(g(z))$. Since $\{x + iy : (1/2)u_{2n} < x < 2u_{2n}, v_{2n} < y < v_{2n+1}\} \cup \{x + iy : (1/2)u_{2n+1} < x < 2u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1} < y < v_{2n+2}\} \subset U_{f,n}^{1/2}$, we conclude that $f(z) = g(z)$ for all $z \in V$, and hence $f = g$.

Consider now the second alternative, that is $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_n = 0$. We claim that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+1} - z_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g^{\circ n}(z) - w_n}{w_{n+1} - w_n}, \quad z \in H.$$

Indeed,

$$h_n(z) = \frac{f^{\circ n}(f(f(1))) - z_n}{z_{n+1} - z_n} \cdot \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+2} - z_n} = h_n(f(f(1))) \cdot \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+2} - z_n};$$

passing to limit in the above equality gives

$$h(z) = h(f(f(1))) \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+2} - z_n} = 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f^{\circ n}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+2} - z_n}.$$

The claim follows now from the fact that

$$\frac{f^{\circ 2n}(z) - z_{2n}}{z_{2n+2} - z_{2n}} = \frac{g^{\circ 2n}(z) - z_{2n}}{z_{2n+2} - z_{2n}}, \quad z \in H, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

With the notation from Theorem 3.3 (ii), we know from [2] that f is injective on $G_m = G_m^f$ for m large enough. Consider a disk $D \subset H$ such that $1, f(1), g(1), f(f(1)) = g(g(1)) \in D$. Since $k_n(z) = (f^{\circ n}(z) - iy_n)/x_n \rightarrow 1$ uniformly on $\overline{D}$, for N large enough,

$B_f = \cup_{n=N}^{\infty} f^{\circ n}(D)$ is a connected subset of G_m . Since $f(B_f) \subseteq B_f$, the functions

$$h_n^*(z) = \frac{f^{\circ(n-N)}(z) - z_n}{z_{n+1} - z_n}, \quad z \in H, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n > N,$$

are injective on B_f . It is easy to observe that $h_n^*(z_N) = 0$ and $h_n^*(z_{N+1}) = 1$. Thus, the sequence $\{h_n^*\}_{n>N}$ converges to a function h^* , defined on H , and injective on B_f . (For details, see [2], page 256.) We have

$$h^*(f^{\circ N}(z)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n^*(f^{\circ N}(z)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_n(z) = h(z), \quad z \in H.$$

The same argument used for h shows that if we replace in the above f by g we obtain a function defined on $B_g = \cup_{n=N}^{\infty} g^{\circ n}(D)$, which coincides with h^* on $B_f \cap B_g$ (it is trivial to observe that $B_f \cap B_g \neq \emptyset$). Moreover, by an argument identical to the one used in the previous case (the case when q_n was bounded away from 0), there exists an open set $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^+$ such that $f^{\circ 2N+1}(z), g^{\circ 2N+1}(z) \in B_f \cap B_g$ for all $z \in V$. Indeed, $f^{\circ 2N+1}(i), g^{\circ 2N+1}(i) \in f^{\circ 2N}(D) = g^{\circ 2N}(D)$, which is an open set. But then $h^*(f^{\circ 2N+1}(z)) = h^*(g^{\circ 2N+1}(z))$, so that, by injectivity of h^* , $f^{\circ 2N+1}(z) = g^{\circ 2N+1}(z)$, $z \in V$, and thus, $f = g$. $\square$

In his paper [19], Carl Cowen has a different approach towards solving Abel's equation. This approach will be useful for proving that every $\triangleright$ -infinitely divisible probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ belongs to a unique semigroup $\{\mu_t : t \geq 0\}$ with respect to monotonic additive convolution. In the following, we shall introduce the notions and results relevant for our proof. For details, we refer to [19].

DEFINITION 3.5. *Given a domain $\Delta \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ and an analytic map $\psi : \Delta \rightarrow \Delta$, we say that V is a fundamental set for ψ on Δ if V is an open, connected, simply connected subset of Δ such that $\psi(V) \subseteq V$ and for each compact set K in Δ , there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\psi^{\circ N}(K) \subseteq V$.*

The main result of [19] is the following theorem:

THEOREM 3.6. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ be analytic, not constant and not a conformal automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$, and let $a \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ be the Denjoy-Wolff point of φ . Assume that $\varphi'(a) \neq 0$. Then there exists a fundamental set V for φ on $\mathbb{D}$, a domain Ω , either the complex plane or*

the unit disk, a linear fractional transformation Φ mapping Ω onto itself, and an analytic mapping $\sigma: \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \Omega$ such that φ and σ are injective on V , $\sigma(V)$ is a fundamental set for Φ on Ω , and $\Phi \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ \varphi$. Moreover, Φ is unique up to conjugation by a linear fractional transformation mapping Ω onto itself, and Φ and σ depend only on φ , not on the particular fundamental set V .

It is shown that, depending on φ , the linear fractional transformation Φ is of one of the following types:

- (1) $\Phi(z) = sz$ for some $s \in \mathbb{D}$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$,
- (2) $\Phi(z) = z + 1$, $z \in \mathbb{C}$,
- (3) $\Phi(z) = \frac{(1+s)z+(1-s)}{(1-s)z+(1+s)}$ for some $s \in (0, 1)$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$,
- (4) $\Phi(z) = \frac{(1 \pm 2i)z - 1}{z - 1 \mp 2i}$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Observe that any linear fractional transformation Φ is contained in a real analytic group with respect to composition: there exists $H: \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \Omega$ such that $H(H(z, t), s) = H(z, t + s)$ and $H(z, n) = \Phi^{on}(z)$ for all $z \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by G the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup H . Consider now a function φ as in the above theorem. Fix a fundamental set V of φ on $\mathbb{D}$, and let $\nu(z) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N}: \varphi^{on}(z) \in V\}$. Define

$$\tau(z) = \inf\{t \geq 0: \nu(z) \leq t, H(\sigma(z), s) \in \sigma(V) \text{ for all } s > t\}.$$

THEOREM 3.7. *Let φ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.6, and let τ be defined as above. There exists a function $\varphi(z, t)$ defined for $z \in \mathbb{D}$ and $t > \tau(z)$, complex analytic in the first argument, real analytic in the second, such that*

$$\varphi(\varphi(z, t), s) = \varphi(z, t + s), \quad t > \tau(z), s > 0,$$

and such that $\varphi(z, n) = \varphi^{on}(z)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > \tau(z)$. The function $\varphi(z, t)$ is defined by

$$\varphi(z, t) = (\sigma|_V)^{-1}(H(\sigma(z), t)), \quad z \in \mathbb{D}, t > \tau(z).$$

Moreover, the function g , given by $g(z) = G(\sigma(z))(\sigma'(z))^{-1}$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, is meromorphic on $\mathbb{D}$, holomorphic on V , and agrees with the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup $\varphi(z, t)$ on the set $\{z \in \mathbb{D}: \tau(z) = 0\}$.

Assume that V satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.6 for φ and consider a compact set with nonempty interior $K \subset V$. Then, by Theorem 3.6, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\Phi^{on}(H(\sigma(z), t)) \in \sigma(V)$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 1, n \geq n_0, z \in K$. But by definition $\Phi^{on}(H(\sigma(z), t)) = H(\sigma(z), t + n)$. Let $w = \Phi^{on}(\sigma(z)) = H(\sigma(z), n) \in \sigma(V)$, so that there exists $v \in V$ such that $\sigma(v) = z$. We claim that $\tau(v) = 0$. Indeed, since $v \in V$, we have $\nu(v) = 0$, and

$$H(\sigma(v), t) = H(H(\sigma(z), n), t) = H(\sigma(z), t + n) \in \sigma(V) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

This proves our claim. We conclude that the interior of the set $V \cap \{z \in \mathbb{D} : \tau(z) = 0\}$ is nonempty.

All the above results can easily be reformulated for self-maps of the upper half-plane.

Recall that the probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ is said to be $\triangleright$ -infinitely divisible if for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a probability measure $\mu_{1/n}$ such that $\mu = \underbrace{\mu_{1/n} \triangleright \cdots \triangleright \mu_{1/n}}_{n \text{ times}}$. The measure $\mu_{1/n}$ will be called an n^{th} root of μ . The following proposition generalizes the results of [25], Proposition 5.4, to measures without compact support.

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Let μ be a $\triangleright$ -infinitely divisible probability measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

- (1) *The family of probability measures $\{\mu_{1/2^n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ can be uniquely extended to a weak*-continuous semigroup $\{\mu_t : t \geq 0\}$ with respect to monotonic additive convolution.*
- (2) *The n^{th} root of μ is unique for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

PROOF. We shall first show that there exists an appropriate fundamental set for our functions $F_{\mu_{2^j}}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let us observe that if $V_{1/n}$ is a fundamental set for $F_{\mu_{1/n}}$ on $\mathbb{C}^+$, then $V_{1/n}$ is a fundamental set for $F_{\mu_{1/n}}^{\circ p} = F_{\mu_{p/n}}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, if $V_{1/n}$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.6 for $F_{\mu_{1/n}}$, then it satisfies the same conditions for $F_{\mu_{p/n}}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, it is clear that $F_{\mu_{p/n}}(V_{1/n}) \subseteq V_{1/n}$, and thus, by the Denjoy-Wolff Theorem (Theorem 1.14), for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}^+$ there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N > 0$, such that $F_{\mu_{p/n}}^{\circ N}(K) \subset V_{1/n}$. Assume now that $z_1, z_2 \in V_{1/n}$ are such that $F_{\mu_{p/n}}(z_1) = F_{\mu_{p/n}}(z_2)$. Then $F_{\mu_{1/n}}(F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_1)) = F_{\mu_{1/n}}(F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_2))$; since $F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_1), F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_2) \in V_{1/n}$, we have that $F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_1) = F_{\mu_{(p-1)/n}}(z_2)$. Iterating this procedure, we obtain that $z_1 = z_2$.

On the other hand, observe that $F_{\mu_{1/n}}$ is injective on V_1 for any fundamental set V_1 of F_μ on $\mathbb{C}^+$. Indeed, if $z_1, z_2 \in V_\mu$ and $F_{\mu_{1/n}}(z_1) = F_{\mu_{1/n}}(z_2)$ then $F_\mu(z_1) = F_\mu(z_2)$, and this implies $z_1 = z_2$.

Fix now $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $V_{1/2^j} \subseteq V_{1/2^{j-1}}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. Proposition 3.4 guarantees the uniqueness of the measures $\mu_{1/2^j}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, we know that there exist σ and $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\sigma(F_\mu(z)) = \sigma(z) + c$. For fixed c , Theorem 3.6 assures us of the uniqueness of σ . If we denote $H(w, t) = w + tc$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $w \in \mathbb{C}$, Theorem 3.7 provides the function $F_{1/2^j}(z) = (\sigma|_V)^{-1}(H(\sigma(z), t))$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, $t > \tau(z)$. We shall find a domain on which these functions coincide with $F_{\mu_{2^{-j}}}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Assume $z \in V_{1/2^n} \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \tau(z) = 0\}$. Then $F_{2^j}(z) = (\sigma|_V)^{-1}(H(\sigma(z), 2^j))$ for all $j \geq -n$. Since $\sigma(F_{2^j}(z)) = \sigma(F_{\mu_{1/2^j}}(z))$ and $F_{2^j}(z), F_{\mu_{1/2^j}}(z) \in V_{\mu_{1/2^n}}$, we have $F_{2^j}(z) = F_{\mu_{1/2^j}}(z)$, for z in an open subset of the upper half-plane, $j \geq -n$. This is true for arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus we have $F_{2^m} = F_{\mu_{2^m}}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Theorem 3.7, $F_{2^j}(z) \rightarrow z$ as j tends to $-\infty$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^+ : \tau(z) = 0\}$. We conclude that $\lim_{j \rightarrow -\infty} F_{\mu_{2^j}}(z) = z$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C}^+$. To obtain μ_t for some $t \in [0, +\infty)$, consider a sequence q_n of dyadic numbers converging to t . By Proposition 1.2, the analytic function $F_t = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_{\mu_{q_n}}$ provides the required measure μ_t by $F_{\mu_t} = F_t$ (the independence of the limit F_t from the chosen sequence q_n follows from the fact that $F_{2^j}(z) \rightarrow z$ as j tends to $-\infty$). This proves (1). Part 2 is an immediate consequence of the uniqueness of the semigroup from part 1. $\square$

Similar results hold for multiplicative monotone convolution of probability measures supported on $[0, +\infty)$ (recall Definition 0.7). However, in this case, the analogue of Proposition 3.8 is an immediate consequence of results of Cowen and Goryainov. Let us first state the analogue of Theorem 3.1:

THEOREM 3.9. *Consider two probability measures μ, ν on $[0, +\infty)$. Then we have*

$$\eta_{\mu \circ \nu}(z) = \eta_\mu(\eta_\nu(z)), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [0, +\infty).$$

For the proof of this theorem, we refer to [6]. Define $\theta: \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0) \rightarrow H$ by $\theta(z) = \sqrt{|z|} e^{\frac{i \arg z}{2}}$, where $\arg z$ is defined as in the beginning of Chapter 2, Section 1.2 on $\mathbb{C}^+$, while $\arg z = -\arg \bar{z}$ if $z \in -\mathbb{C}^+$, and $\arg z = 0$ if $z \in (0, +\infty)$. Then the function

$$\mathcal{V}: \mathbb{C} \setminus (-\infty, 0) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}, \quad \mathcal{V}(z) = \frac{\theta(-z) - 1}{\theta(-z) + 1},$$

is a conformal automorphism such that $\mathcal{V}((-\infty, 0)) = (-1, 1)$. Thus, for any probability measure μ on the positive half-line, the function $\phi_\mu(z) = \mathcal{V}(\eta_\mu(\mathcal{V}^{-1}(z)))$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$, is a self-map of the unit disk that maps the interval $(-1, 1)$ into itself. Moreover, it is trivial to see that η_μ belongs to a composition semigroup $\{\eta_{\mu_t}: t \geq 0\}$ if and only if ϕ_μ belongs to a composition semigroup $\{\phi_{\mu_t}: t \geq 0\}$, and the correspondence is given by $\phi_{\mu_t}(z) = \mathcal{V}(\eta_{\mu_t}(\mathcal{V}^{-1}(z)))$, $z \in \mathbb{D}$. In [23], Goryainov shows that any analytic self-map ϕ of the unit disk preserving the interval $(-1, 1)$ which is the n -iteration of an analytic self-map ϕ_n of $\mathbb{D}$ satisfying $\phi_n((-1, 1)) \subseteq (-1, 1)$ can be embedded in a one-parameter semigroup with respect to composition (this fact can be also derived from Theorem 5.1 and its corollary from [19]). This, of course, provides the equivalent of Proposition 3.8 for multiplicative monotone convolution on $[0, +\infty)$.

Bibliography

- [1] N. I. Akhiezer, *The classical moment problem and some related questions in analysis*, Hafner Publishing Co., New York, 1965
- [2] I. N. Baker and Ch. Pommerenke, *On the iteration of analytic functions in a halfplane. II.*, J. London Math. Soc (2), **20**, no.2, (1979), 255–258
- [3] S. T. Belinschi, *The atoms of the free multiplicative convolution for two probability distributions*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **46**, (2003), 377–386.
- [4] S. T. Belinschi and H. Bercovici, *Atoms and regularity for measures in a partially defined free convolution semigroup*, Math. Z., **248**, (2004), no. 4, 665–674.
- [5] S. T. Belinschi and H. Bercovici, *Partially Defined Semigroups Relative to Multiplicative Free Convolution*, Internat. Math. Res. Not., to appear
- [6] H. Bercovici, *Multiplicative monotone convolution*, Preprint 2004 Arxiv http://www.arxiv.org/PS_cache/math/pdf/0406/0406488.pdf
- [7] H. Bercovici, *A remark on monotonic convolution*, Preprint 2004
- [8] H. Bercovici and V. Pata, *Stable laws and domains of attraction in free probability theory*, With an appendix by Philippe Biane, Ann. of Math. (2), **149**, (1999), no.3, 1023–1060
- [9] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu, *Lévy-Hinčin type theorems for multiplicative and additive free convolution*, Pacific J. Math., **153**, (1992), no.2, 217–248
- [10] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu, *Convolutions of measures with unbounded support*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **42** (1993), 733–773.
- [11] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu, *Superconvergence to the central limit and failure of the Cramér theorem for free random variables*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **103** (1995), 215–222.
- [12] H. Bercovici and D. Voiculescu, *Regularity questions for free convolution*, Nonselfadjoint operator algebras, operator theory, and related topics, 37–47, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl. 104, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998.
- [13] P. Biane, *Processes with free increments*, Math. Z. **227** (1998), 143–174.
- [14] P. Billingsley, *Probability and measure* Third edition. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, New York, 1995

- [15] M. Bożejko, *Positive definite functions on the free group and the noncommutative Riesz product*, Boll. Un. Math. Ital. **5A** (1986), 13–22.
- [16] M. Bożejko and J. Wysoczański, *Remarks on t -transforms of measures and convolutions*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **37**(2001), 737–761.
- [17] C. Carathéodory, *Über die Winkelderivierten von beschränkten analytischen Funktionen*, Sitzungsbericht Preuss. Akad. Phys. Math. **4**(1929), 1–18.
- [18] E. F. Collingwood and A. J. Lohwater, *The theory of cluster sets*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, No. 56 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1966)
- [19] C. C. Cowen, *Iteration and the solution of functional equations for functions analytic in the unit disk*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **265**, (1981), no. 1, 69–95
- [20] A. Denjoy, *Sur l'iteration des fonctions analytiques*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **182**(1926), 255–257.
- [21] U. Franz, *Boolean convolution of probability measures on the unit circle*, Preprint 2004, Arxiv http://www.arxiv.org/PS_cache/math/pdf/0403/0403243.pdf
- [22] J. B. Garnett, *Bounded analytic functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [23] V. V. Goryainov, *One-parameter semigroups of analytic functions and a compositional analogue of infinite divisibility*, Proceedings of the Institute of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, Vol. 5, Tr. Inst. Prikl. Mat. Mekh., **5**, (2000), 44–57,
- [24] G. Julia, *Extension d'un lemme de Schwarz*, Acta Math. **42**(1920), 349–355.
- [25] N. Muraki, *Monotonic convolution and monotone Lévy-Hinčin formula*, Preprint 2000
- [26] A. Nica and R. Speicher, *On the multiplication of free N -tuples of noncommutative random variables*, Amer. J. Math. **118** (1996), 799–837.
- [27] Ch. Pommerenke, *On the iteration of analytic functions in a halfplane*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), **19**, no.3, (1979), 439–447
- [28] S. Saks, *Theory of the integral*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1964
- [29] J. H. Shapiro, *Composition operators and classical function theory*, Springer, New York, 1993.
- [30] R. Speicher and R. Woroudi *Boolean convolution*, Fields Institute Communications, Vol. 12 (D. Voiculescu, ed.), AMS, 1997, 267–279
- [31] D. Voiculescu, *Addition of certain noncommuting random variables*, J. Funct. Anal. **66** (1986), 323–346.
- [32] D. Voiculescu, *Multiplication of certain noncommuting random variables*, J. Operator Theory **18**(1987), 223–235.
- [33] D. Voiculescu, *The analogues of entropy and of Fisher's information measure in free probability theory. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), 411–440.
- [34] D. Voiculescu, *The coalgebra of the free difference quotient and free probability*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (2000), 79–106.

- [35] D. Voiculescu, *Analytic subordination consequences of free Markovianity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51**(2002). 1161–1166.
- [36] D.V. Voiculescu, K.J. Dykema and A. Nica, *Free Random Variables*, CRM Monograph Series, Vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992.
- [37] J. Wolff, *Sur l'iteration des fonctions bornées*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **182**(1926), 200-201.
- [38] J. Wolff, *Sur une généralisation d'un théorème de Schwarz*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **182**(1926), 918–920.